

# DOUGLASS' MONTHLY.

"OPEN THY MOUTH FOR THE DUMB, IN THE CAUSE OF ALL SUCH AS ARE APPOINTED TO DESTRUCTION; OPEN THY MOUTH, JUDGE RIGHTEOUSLY, AND PLEAD THE CAUSE OF THE POOR AND NEEDY."—1st Eccl. xxi. 8, 9.

VOLUME II. }  
NUMBER II. }

ROCHESTER, N. Y., (U. S.) JULY, 1859.

PRICE—  
FIVE SHILLINGS PER ANNUM.

## CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT NUMBER.

Help from Abroad to the Church of the Puritans	97
The War in Europe	97
The True Test	98
The American War, vs. the European War	98
Death of Dr. Bailey	99
Trouble among the Garrisonians	100
Aid from Abroad to Dr. Cheever's Church	101
Acknowledgment	101
The Cruelty of Southern Slavery	101
Mr. Jay's Review of Mr. Lord's Argument before the Tract Society	103
Letters from the Old World	107
Slander upon Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans	108
Kidnapping in Pennsylvania	108
An F. F. V. and Daughter	109
Hyannis Bedeviled	109
Ex-Communicated	109
Recollections of Joseph Sturge	110
Miscellaneous News Items	112

We take the liberty of using the names of the following gentlemen who will receive names and subscriptions for the *Monthly*:

*London*—Mr. L. A. CAMEROVZOW, A. S. Office, 27 New Broad street, E. C.

*Dublin*—Mr. WM. WEBB, 52 High street, and 8 Dunville Avenue, Rathmines.

*Derby*—Dr. SPENCER T. HALL, Burton Road.

*Glasgow*—Mr. JOHN SMITH, 173 Trongate.

*Halifax*—Rev. RUSSELL LANT CARPENTER, Milton Place.

*Leeds*—Mr. ARTHUR HOLLAND, 4 Park Row.

*Newcastle-on-Tyne*—Mr. W. S. PRINGLE.

## HELP FROM ABROAD TO THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS.

An effort is just now being made in anti-slavery circles abroad to procure pecuniary aid for the Church of the Puritans, of which Rev. GEO. B. CHEEVER is pastor, in the city of New York. The person who is chiefly interested in this mission is Miss JOHNSTONE, a member of the Church of the Puritans, and a zealous friend of the principles which have made that church remarkably conspicuous of late. We hardly need say for ourselves that this effort to sustain the Church of the Puritans in this hour of its extreme necessities, commands our entire and cordial approval.—There are times in the history of almost every righteous cause, when it finds its centre and strong hold in a single individual, who because of it, becomes magnified and glorified, as the embodiment of the fortunes of that cause.—To hold up the hands of such an one, for the cause's sake, becomes an act of high wisdom and of sacred duty. The anti-slavery cause, like all other good causes, has its representative men of to-day. They are not self-elected, nor are they chosen by the suffrages of anti-slavery men. They are often designated by the enemies, rather than by the friends of the cause they serve. To-day it is MOSES; to-morrow it is JOSHUA; and next day it is some one else. Men must allow themselves to be used by these good causes, just as old garments are used, put on, or put off, just as the wearer may choose, or the necessities of the case may require. He is a most wise and modest man who has the wit to apprehend

and the meekness to retire at the right time.—In running the eye over the list of the able, earnest and efficient anti-slavery men of America, we naturally pause at the name of Dr. GEO. B. CHEEVER. He is evidently the man for the hour, around whose head the terrible wrath and fire of all that is malignant and revengeful, of all that is bitterly slaveholding in the spirit and power of the American evangelical church, are flashing and howling in a perfect storm.

Dr. CHEEVER can have no better recommendation to the cordial sympathy and support of the generous anti-slavery people in England, and no better certificate of his faithfulness, than is furnished by the fact that his anti-slavery preaching has completely driven from him nearly all the wealth by which the Church of the Puritans was formerly sustained, and that, like his Great Master, it is mainly the common people that now hear him gladly. For the moment, we know of no better work than to hold up his hands by means of sympathy and money. There is not a man among all the friends of the slave in this country upon whom the venom and gall of pro-slavery are more liberally showered, nor one whom the pro-slavery church would rather have crippled and silenced, than GEO. B. CHEEVER. They would use his misfortune as a means of deterring all ministers of religion from following his disastrous example, and ascribe their own pious prosperity to the fact that they never meddle with popular sin, except to excuse it, and with unpopular reform, except to denounce it, or to disparage and hinder those by whom it is advocated.

We speak thus of Doctor CHEEVER, and the effort making to sustain him, all the more readily, because we perceive in certain quarters, which we need not name, a disposition to pour cold water, or something worse, upon the labors of the zealous Miss JOHNSTONE, who is nobly sustaining her pastor in his anti-slavery position and labors—mainly on the ground that Doctor CHEEVER is in Christian fellowship with the pro-slavery evangelical churches of America. We do not deny that Doctor CHEEVER is in form connected with the evangelical Christians of America; we do not deny that such Christians, as a mass, are about as pro-slavery as slaveholders and Satan would have them to be; nor do we deny that Doctor CHEEVER is grossly inconsistent even in giving a formal indorsement of pro-slavery evangelical churches as Christian, by remaining in fellowship with them; but this we do deny—we deny that there is any *real fellowship* between GEO. B. CHEEVER and such churches. And while Doctor CHEEVER goes through the land a blazing anti-slavery torch, unmasking, exposing, denouncing, ridiculing, and repudiating the Christianity of such churches, and is powerfully lifting the public mind to a higher Christianity, we shall not, when asked to throw in our shilling, stop to inquire whether Dr. CHEEVER has previously severed all his formal

ecclesiastical connections or not. It is enough for us, for the moment, that this man is doing a true man's work for the abolition of American slavery. A church connection can be broken up in two ways—one by formal withdrawal—and one by standing upon a plain of righteousness and humanity, which is a rebuke and a condemnation of the Church.—The latter way is the way of Rev. GEORGE B. CHEEVER.

**THE WAR IN EUROPE.**—An intelligent German friend, warmly devoted to the cause of liberty for all mankind, writes as follows of the war: 'All my sympathies are getting more and more interested in the progress of the war, and although I never shall trust the sincerity of LOUIS NAPOLEON, as long as he serves the good cause as he is now serving it, any lover of freedom must rejoice in his victories and the humiliation of Austria, which latter is the most retrograde, oppressive, cruel and bigoted power in all Europe. Even in the worst case, I should consider French tyranny preferable to this established Austrian nuisance. I, therefore, enjoy its present mortification, and shall more enjoy its total destruction. The same feeling would rise, if LOUIS NAPOLEON, or some other enterprising and energetic adventurer, should at once invade the slave States of America, and subject to his iron rule the slaveholders, making them change conditions with the slaves. To see the European monarchs trembling at the idea of such a fate, gives me the greatest satisfaction.' This view of the great struggle in Europe is shared very generally by enlightened Europeans in this country.—LOUIS NAPOLEON would be hailed as a Liberator, although he should only substitute French for Austrian tyranny.

**THE COLORED PEOPLE OF INDIANA.**—The people of color in Charleston and township Indiana, number about two hundred and five old and young, composing thirty-six families—thirty of which are the owners of their own homesteads, some of them are handsome farms. They are, as a general thing, an industrious, enterprising people. There is one characteristic about them worthy of notice, and that is, in the winter season they send their children to school, and some who have arrived to man and womanhood attend the school.—But, as soon as the spring season makes its appearance, every thing that can handle an axe, plow, hoe, spade, or rake, is out and gone; thus training to education and industry both. This is about as it should be, and quite different from the training of children in those large cities.

The Galveston (Texas) News of June 14th contains a jubilant letter from a planter in Mississippi announcing his recent visit to a plantation in Canton, in that State, where he found sixteen recently imported Africans at work.

Senator Wilson and Carl Schurz, it is said, intend to visit Wisconsin, and address the people in behalf of Republicanism.



## THE TRUE TEST.

Slavery is the great test question of our age and nation. It, above all others, enables us to draw the line between the precious and the vile, whether in individuals, creeds, sects or parties. It marks, with the distinctness of summer-lightning upon a black cloud, the point dividing common honesty from knavery, benevolence from selfishness, magnanimity from meanness, elevation from baseness, moral courage from cowardice, sincere devotion from half-hearted, and hypocritical pretension, "pure religion and undefiled," from a corrupt, putrid and dead religion, having no beneficent relation to the "age and body of the times" in which it exists.

No test, as we think, can be better than this for our country. In England, a few years ago, there was a special test of character presented in the movement for the abolition of the Corn Laws. These laws imposed a heavy tax upon bread. While wheat and corn rotted on the western prairies for the want of purchasers, men, women and children were starving for bread in Manchester, Birmingham, Newcastle, and in different parts of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The cry for bread coming up from hungry millions touched the hearts of philanthropic men and women in England, and the result was the Anti Corn Law movement. It was a movement with but one plank in its platform, and that was taken from the system of Christianity as expounded by the great founder of Christianity, "*Feed the hungry.*" The question was, shall the poor have bread? and the country was divided on that question. Not that anybody would come forward, and directly deny that the poor should be fed. Oh! no. The devil is an entirely too skillful debater and manager to place his cause at such a disadvantage. The demand to open the iron gates of England to the breadstuffs of our western prairies was resisted on the plausible ground that the measure would depress and ruin the agricultural interests of England, bless the manufacturing districts of the country, while it would depress and curse the agricultural. The cloven foot of selfishness can never be entirely concealed, and the claims of justice and benevolence can never be entirely obscured. All that was partial, selfish, and insensible to the cry of the poor and the needy, went to its own place for the Corn Laws, while all opposite qualities went in the opposite direction for repeal of the Corn Laws. In due season, after a long and earnest struggle, the right prevailed. England has now another great test, another measuring reed laid down, by which the character of her present generation may be tried, as it was tried twelve or fifteen years ago—i. e., the enlargement and equalization of the Elective Franchise. On this question England is divided; but as in the case of the Corn Laws, there is no division of opinion here on this question of Suffrage. We rejoiced in the downfall of the British Corn Laws, because we wanted the poor to have bread, and because we wanted to sell them our breadstuffs. We shall rejoice in the extension and equalization of Suffrage in England, because it is right in itself, and because it is of republican tendency. The case, however, would be very different if the people in England, to whom it were proposed to extend the right of Suffrage, were of the anti-republican complex-

ion of the writer of this. What is now to them quite clear, would then be confused; what is now certain, would be then quite doubtful. Such is the effect of selfishness on the judgment. But to return. Slavery is today our test-unfailing of the character of our people, our politics and our government, our pulpit, our civilization and religion. We shall never weary in denouncing any people, politics, government, pulpit or religion, which have no abhorrence for slavery, and no heart to work for the abolition of slavery. For wherever a true, active, and genuine anti-slavery cannot be found, whether in the Church or in the State there "the salt has lost its savor, and is henceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under the feet of men."

Especially is this true of religion and religious bodies. Religion is or ought to be, the pillar of fire by night, leading (not following) a world lying in wickedness out of the bondage of sin and darkness into righteousness and truth. In the name of all the hosts of Heaven, of what use is a religion whose highest votaries are so blind that they cannot see that to enslave a man is a sin? A decent devil has a vision clear enough for that. THOMAS PAINE, the infidel, who was never a subject of the new birth, whose spiritual vision was never touched by the anointing of the Holy Ghost—a man who is now denounced by the church as the most depraved of men—even he, was not so lost to all that is just, honest and humane, as not to see and feel that slavery was a great wrong. He not only held slavery to be a great wrong, but had the courage and manliness to denounce it as an abomination. Ten thousand times over we prefer the no-religion of TOM PAINE, with his hatred and denunciation of oppression, to the miserable, time-serving, hypocritical, and sneaking piety of the *American Tract Society*, which can see that it is a sin to move the feet to the sound of music, and cannot see that it is a sin to steal and barter in human beings.

The anti-slavery movement which has been pressed upon the attention of the American people with singular zeal, earnestness and ability for more than a quarter of a century, has now to report as the only marked point of its progress, that it has constructed a political party in favor of confining slavery within its present limits, and caused a few branches of the American church at the North to look for a neutral position, which will enable them to "run with the hare and hold with the hounds," to maintain fellowship with slaveholders and slave-traders, and yet to claim that they are not pro-slavery, because they in remote localities allow a minister to pray that "*oppression may cease throughout the world.*" Of all the terrible wrongs and frightful horrors narrated of slavery, very little has resulted to the church of the country save a slight apprehension that an extremely pro-slavery position may damage the reputation of the church in certain northern latitudes. That's all. No grand uprising in the name of God against slavery has taken place. We have sat by, with aching heart, and watched with longing eye, for the angel of the American church to move the stagnant pool of American piety, in pity for the perishing millions in chains; but up to this time the eye has lighted on no object affording a hope of relief from this source.

The Church Anti-Slavery Society was an

indication, and we hailed it with heartfelt satisfaction. The two CHEEVERS, a noble pair of brothers, stepped bravely forth in this church movement; but the evidence is too glaring that that movement is chilled in its very birth, by the icy indifference of the great mass of American evangelical churches and ministers towards the new Society. We shall continue our remarks on this subject in subsequent numbers of our paper.

## THE AMERICAN WAR, VERSUS THE EUROPEAN WAR.

While Europe has her war—a terrible and dreadful war—a war in which men are slain by the thousand, and flung like dead dogs into the ditch, weltering in their warm blood, fighting, fighting, fighting—fighting they hardly know whom, and for they hardly know what, settling no great principle of national or personal right, looking at best only for a change of masters on the one hand, and who that master shall be on the other, whether, in a word, FRANCIS JOSEPH or LOUIS NAPOLEON, France or Austria, shall be master in Italy—while, we say, this terrible but meaningless war is going on in Europe, a tremendous conflict, a conflict in view of its principles, far more important, is going on here in America between a true and a spurious Christianity, between religious formalities wedded to popular iniquity, and living, "vital godliness," seeking to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free.

"I came not to send peace but a sword," said the mighty God clothed in humanity, and so hath it proved. The Christianity of Christ to-day is just what it was on the Mount of Olives eighteen hundred years ago—a two-edged sword, sternly and unflinchingly smiting down time honored systems of pride and selfishness, disturbing and scattering their sanctimonious upholders, by revealing to the world their true character, whited sepulchres, appearing outwardly beautiful, but within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness.

Against admitted sins, sins condemned by the Scribes and Pharisees, sins which made the sinner infamous, sins condemned by every body, sins which made the self-righteous Jews avert their eyes with pious horror, and to thank God "that they were not as other men"—against such sins, Christ, the Christian's God, had but little testimony to bear. His thunders were reserved for those sins which hid themselves in the trailing garments of piety. He passed by the publican and harlot to let down his consuming fires upon the "generations of vipers, hypocrites, children of their father the devil, pious men, men who tithed mint, annis and cummin, and omitted the weightier matters of the law, who bound heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, who devour widow's houses and for a pretense make long prayers"—these and others, in high places, roused the "Lion of the Tribe of Judah," and called down his holy wrath like a storm of unquenchable fire. His was not the common place, pliable, free and easy piety of the times. His religion was for man, as well as for God, and for the poor man, especially and peculiarly for the poor man. "Tell John, the poor have the gospel preached unto them," was one of the proofs of his Messiahship. Wherever there was a cry for mercy coming up from the depths of oppression and power, the hand of the Incarnate God was out-



stretched to succor and relieve. The religion of Jesus is like himself, a copy of himself. His heart is with the bleeding heart of humanity, whether under the slaveholder's lash or the tyrant's law. He cannot be dragged into the service of slavery, nor can his religion. A slaveholding Christ and a slaveholding Christianity is a false Christ, and a spurious Christianity, no matter how scrupulously the one is worshipped and how loudly the other is professed.

The great struggle going on in our land between freedom and slavery, is full of significance, not merely as concerns the ideas signified by the terms *freedom* and *slavery*, but as to the ascendancy of a pure, living, active and genuine Christianity on the one hand, and that which on the other is emasculated, corrupt, torpid, lifeless, a minister of moral death, sustaining no useful and beneficent relation to the times and circumstances of the age and nation in which it exists, but which is really the handmaid of iniquity, the obedient and willing panderer to the popular pride and lusts of the national heart, ready to excuse crime by silence, and to substitute the hollow form of godliness for the fair dealings of common honesty. The conflict is between a pure and a spurious Christianity.

Be not deceived. All is not gold that glitters. The church draws a line between its members and others, styling the one class saints, and the other class sinners. It assumes to be more holy than the rest of the world. Wherein does its superior holiness appear, and of what does it consist? They "say prayers," sing psalms, build churches, and beautifully adorn them, attend church on Sunday, take the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and submit to the ordinance of baptism. Against none of these things have we one word to say. "These things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone." Yet they are in no wise to be taken as evidence of superior goodness, in those who practice them. Experience shows that they are not worth a straw as determining who is and who is not a true and loyal disciple of the Son of God.

A man may sing psalms, because he loves music, not because he loves God, or the sentiment expressed in the words. A church may be built in worship of human pride, and decorated to gratify human taste, more than for the glory of God or for the salvation of the world. Self-love, self-gratification, self-importance, taste for display, are all admirably provided for in the external forms and arrangements of American Christianity. To float along with them, requires no mortification of the flesh, no self-denial, no moral courage, no earnest searching after truth, no energetic exertion, to improve the condition of mankind, no concern for the poor and needy, no resistance to any popular iniquity, no hostility to mischief framed by law—but simple easy acquiescence with things as they are, an unquestioning and an unhesitating acceptance of the creed. The man who can do this, finds the church one of the most agreeable places in the world. It does not at all militate against his Christian piety, that he believes that slaveholding is a divine institution, that God sanctions slavery, that negroes are only fit to be the slaves of white people, that the foreign slave-trade was a great blessing, that slaveholders are very respectable gentlemen, and that Abolitionists are a despicable set.—

He may hold, enjoy and promulgate these opinions without rebuke from the pastor, or disapproval of the church. Indeed, he may become a slaveholder, and buy and sell his brothers and sisters in the Lord, if they be but a few shades darker than himself, and still be accounted a devout Christian.

Such is but a faint picture of that kind of Christianity which is organized, and has command of the religious resources of this country, and which rests like a grim and horrid incubus upon the bleeding breast of humanity. It is the Anti-Christ, the Scarlet Lady, the "Beast" of our age, against which all that is just, wise and humane in the universe is and ought to be arrayed.

The conflict involved in the anti-slavery movement is against this religion. We can only advance in the direction of bringing this guilty slaveholding nation to repentance by battling, dislodging, and supplanting this popular, formal and corrupt Christianity by a better Christianity—the Christianity of Christ—a Christianity which embraces in its beneficent regard the negro as well as the white man, the poor as well as the rich.

The necessity for making this direct attack upon the headquarters of a corrupt but almost all-prevailing religion, is found in the fact that it stands immediately in the way of the abolition of slavery. There is no getting round it. We must attack, denounce and expose, or desert the slave. It occupies the ground upon which we must stand, or our cause fails.—The anti-slavery cause must be adopted as an imperative Christian duty by the people of this country, or it will never receive that earnest and determined enforcement needful to overthrow a system of gigantic selfishness like slavery. Men must feel that in serving the slave, they are serving God, following the example of Christ, destroying the works of the Devil, and thus building up the kingdom of God in the world.

Nothing stands so opposed to this essential conviction of the dignity and duty of the anti-slavery cause, as the evangelical churches of our country. That against which we cry aloud and spare not, they are, with but few exceptions, as dumb as death in regard to. That which we denounce as a stupendous transgression of the law of the Living God, they regard and treat as no sin at all, and regard as no duty at all. They have inverted and turned upside down all the fundamental principles of Christian ethics, putting light for darkness and darkness for light, and are teaching the people accordingly.

In this great conflict, by a strange perversion, which shows how completely the public mind and heart of the nation have been abused and darkened, those who are arrayed in defense of the American slave system—a system of immeasurable and unmitigated piracy and pollution—are esteemed as the followers of Jesus Christ, while those who oppose and seek to abolish slavery, are held up and treated as the enemies of religion. Virtue has here to ask pardon of vice, and the religionists of to-day, like those of old, "call the master of the house Beelzebub," and imitate their example in other respects. Nevertheless, the daylight is dawning—the people are awaking—they are beginning pretty earnestly to inquire of what use is a religion which has banished mercy and humanity from its creed and conduct. The American Tract Society

has done a great work in opening the eyes of men hitherto blind to the true character of our evangelical institutions. One or two more of such meetings as the last would be of immense service.

#### DEATH OF DR. BAILEY.

The brief telegraphic announcement of the death of this eminent anti-slavery Editor, will be unexpected and exceedingly sad news to tens of thousands all over the free States of the American Union. Though comparatively a young man, Dr. BAILEY has been conspicuously connected with the anti-slavery press of the country for a quarter of a century, exerting all the while a marked and decided influence in shaping and directing especially the political relations of the anti-slavery cause.—He was a man in whose character were blended, to a remarkable degree, a manly courage, and a wise discretion. Few men could have succeeded as well as he, in the difficult and dangerous positions he has occupied, both in Cincinnati, when editing the *Philanthropist*, in early mob times, and in Washington, editing the *National Era* during the last dozen years. He was a man of immense industry, perseverance and zeal, and undoubtedly has found an early grave as the penalty of overtaxing and wearing out his constitution. The whole anti-slavery press of the country will miss him, and sincerely lament his unlooked for decease.

Scarcely a week arrives and departs, of late, in which we are not called upon to record the removal by death of some eminent person connected with the cause of emancipation. Star after star falls from the anti-slavery firmament, leaving its place dark and cheerless, and the eyes of those who knew and loved the departed, tearful and sad. The thought will come: who shall take and worthily fill their places? Who shall continue the conflict with slavery, which these good men have so nobly commenced and carried on for years? Who will, nay, who can take the place of Doctor BAILEY at the National capital? While he was far behind some of our anti-slavery men in respect to the true anti-slavery interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, and fell far short, we think, of claiming all that he might have claimed for the slave under the Federal Government, he was, nevertheless, a most able and vigilant servant of the anti-slavery cause within the sphere marked out for himself. His paper, the *National Era*, has steadily advocated the principles which it professed at the beginning, and has neither turned to the right nor the left. The presence of Dr. BAILEY in the District of Columbia exerted a powerful influence in favor of freedom and humanity in that den of slaveholding abominations. Truly, the cause of the slave in Washington has lost a most useful and honored advocate in the death of Dr. GAMALIEL BAILEY.

There is in the Portsmouth (Va.) Transcript an advertisement by the Collector, proposing to sell, on the 18th inst., thirty-six free negroes—men and boys, and seventy women and girls, under a provision of the city charter directing the sale of all free negroes who fail to pay their taxes.

The Evening Star Division Sons of Temperance of Charlestown, Mass., are in great tribulation on account of a colored man having been permitted to join the lodge.



## TROUBLE AMONG THE GARRISONIANS.

It may be a weakness, yet all must confess it to be an amiable weakness, and to that extent a commendable one, that we continue to take a very lively interest in the history and fortunes of this ancient anti-slavery sect.—The fact may be explained by the consideration that *first love* is never forgotten, and perhaps never entirely extinguished. A man may not work with a body of his fellows, twelve or fourteen years, in earnest and confiding affection, for the accomplishment of a great and glorious object, without having his inmost soul clothed with a perfect net work of subtle and mysterious cords, some of which will, though broken, cling about him through all the years of his life, long or short. But whether this is sound or unsound philosophy, is of but little consequence in this particular case. It is enough that we tell the simple truth about the continued interest felt by us, in the life and fortunes of a sect to which we were, or thought we were, strongly attached. Honesty, however, compels us to say, lest any one should misinterpret the nature of this *interest*, and give to it a more serious and tender character than is compatible with the rough and violent usage to which it has been subjected during the last seven years, that the feeling to which we have most freely confessed does not restrain, or more correctly, does not prevent a certain degree of honest satisfaction at any little healthy, though disagreeable commotion we may be permitted to witness in the operations of the sect. We, perhaps, from long acquaintance with the body, and close observation of its habits and modes of proceeding, more readily detect, than an uninitiated outsider would be able to do, the first signs of the approach of anything remarkable from that quarter. We have seen for several years past, a slight division of sentiment between leading individuals connected with the Garrisonian party, as to the proper manner and spirit of conducting the anti-slavery movement. This division which we have watched in silence has of late become more open and decided, and has in truth nearly reached a crisis.

To speak plainly—STEPHEN S. FOSTER, a man whose vocation during the last twenty ears has been to keep the margin between abolitionism and anti-abolitionism in church and state, so broad that there could be no mistake as to which was which, and who, though often opposed at first by the most able and eloquent men among the Garrisonians, has always carried the vital force of the sect with him. Whatever this FOSTER would say, in all the terrible sternness of another JOHN KNOX, he was sure at last to bring Mr. PHILLIPS to repeat in the charming dress of a polished and beautiful rhetoric, BURLEIGH to defend with his logic, and GARRISON to defend by the power of his 'unconquerable will.' The fact is, though Mr. FOSTER is seldom named as a leader, he is and has for years been the real leader of the Garrisonian forces. Impulsive, energetic, and often injudicious, so judged by his party as well as the outside barbarians, yet honest and brave—a man who really fulfills the old motto of the *Standard*, 'Without compromise and without concealment'—and therefore a man to be respected and honored. This FOSTER has been a great troubler to the conservative element in the Garrisonian camp. He has everlastingly been exposing the shortcomings of the sect, and insisting upon its

taking more bold and a decided ground at this and that point. With him have stood HENRY C. WRIGHT and PARKER PILLSBURY. These three men, despite of the polish, elegance and refinement in the party, have given that rough iron cast to the tongue and pen which have become distinctive of the sect. These three men have been the 'field hands' of the Garrison anti-slavery movement. This force in the society has been increased of late, by such men as A. T. FOSS, A. M. POWELL, and J. H. HOWLAND. They are unqualified denouncers of the Republican party, and all parties which occupy, in their judgment, an equivocal position on the subject of slavery. They look upon all who do not come up to their position, such as BEECHER, CHEEVER and PARKER, as positive hinderers, rather than helpers.

Now this sort of stringency, this determination that there shall be no climbing up some other way, has become painful to some of the brotherhood, and more especially of the sisterhood in Boston and over the sea! A determination is manifested to have done with it altogether. Large heads and tiny hands have been busy in the work of bringing these unruly and trouble-making persons to their senses. Mr. FOSTER & Co. must either come to terms or be put out of the synagoge. We shall see which element in the Society will succumb—whether the careful, the prudent, the sagacious and diplomatic element, or the open, bold, energetic and manly element, shall prevail. Meanwhile, if FOSTER and his rebel band, are not won back to the fold, it will not be for the want of warning public and private, open and covert.

The last of these warnings which have come to our notice, was in the *Anti-Slavery Standard* of June 25th. Although the *Standard* claims for its utterances that they are 'without concealment,' it will be seen that the following from its foreign correspondent, is sufficiently obscure to rank with the first diplomatic papers of the times. It seems to us that the article might have been written in Boston, revised in England, and again retouched in Boston.

'May it be permitted to add that your friends here have another embarrassing question to deal with? It was always difficult to explain to inquirers the point to which controversy, wrangle, attaint of character reached among the Abolitionists, and to reason away the complaint that mutual distrust, accusation and denunciation took place wherever Abolitionists appeared; but your friends could honestly show, to all who would listen, that it was your first business, your inevitable duty and doom, to prove all persons, as well as all things, and purge away all that could weaken as well as defile your body. Till this was done, you who were the salt of your earth, could not keep your savor. It was the very condition of fitness for your work of staying corruption. The case, at the end of twenty years—or say ten or five—is wholly changed. You now lead public opinion, as is shown by the hypocrisy of worldlings in professing abolitionism. How is it that some two or three of your heartiest comrades cannot see that a wider duty opens with your elevation of position? One would think you would all be glad to remit the charge of other folks' souls, when their condition is no longer your express and vital concern; yet we see the habit of accusation and vituperation perpetuated when the occasion has passed. It is for the Abolitionists now to lead, and for others to look to themselves as to how and when they follow.—Let them take care of that! It seems to us a deplorable mistake to turn back, or keep your faces reverted, and charge yourselves

with the responsibilities of persons and parties who have their own effort to make, and their own path to clear, to get up to you. Your time and temper are too precious now to be spent, as was necessary, in fighting with your neighbors, in order to obtain a footing for fighting slavery. The monster is before you now, face to face, and society is behind you, instead of crowded between you and it. Let those behind you be of what quality they may, your concern is with the monster, and not with them. If they help you from behind or come up to your side, well and good. If they cannot, so much the worse for them; but why lose your time and strength in scolding them or picking out their faults? Why waste precious hours, and jar a propitious harmony, by occupying yourselves with the weak parts of the imperfect, and the halting of novices? You will never be found fraternizing with hypocrites; and if you wait where you are till all who condemn slavery are proved to be of your quality, the world will be more disposed to question your quality and destination than it has ever been yet. You know whom I mean; and they will know it; the two or three sincere and zealous workers who deserve all honor for former work, but who have not lately given evidence of the enlightenment, modesty, justice and moderation which your improved position demands. Will they not either defer to the sense of the proved leaders of the cause or undertake a department where they can do their own work in their own way? It is certain that they are doing more harm by impeachments which the world sees to be groundless than they can compensate for by any manifestation of virtues so misplaced as to look like faults of great gravity. It is a grave responsibility to impair or disturb your force while in full march on the open battle-field. Such is the view of your and their friends; and I do not apologize for communicating it. We desire to understand each other, in order to co-operate.

'Yours, &c.,

H. M.'

To help our readers to an understanding of this important paragraph, 'some two or three,' should be read FOSTER and those who think with him. 'Remit the charge of other folks' souls,' means give up all concern as to the quality of other men's Abolitionism. 'The habit of accusation and vituperation perpetuated when the occasion is past'—the habit of denouncing political anti-slavery men, acquired when their numbers were small and therefore powerless, should not be continued now that their numbers are large—and this for very obvious reasons. 'Let those behind you, be of what quality they may, your concern is with the monster, and not with them.' This is the same idea of remitting the 'charge of other folks' souls.' 'You know whom I mean, and they will know it.' The 'you' and 'they' spoken of here, are sufficiently indicated already. There can be no doubt that the parties themselves understand the pronouns 'you' and 'they' exactly. They seem to be pitted against each other quite squarely; 'you' means the enlightened, modest, just, and moderate party, among the Garrisonians; 'they' stands for those 'WHO HAVE NOT LATELY GIVEN EVIDENCE OF ENLIGHTENMENT, MODESTY, JUSTICE AND MODERATION.' 'Will they not either defer to the sense of the proved leaders of the cause, or undertake a department of the work where they can do their own work in their own way?' This, in plain English, means that Mr. FOSTER and Company should either bow to the authority of certain eminent leaders from whom he differs, or go out of the Garrisonian ranks. We shall see whether Mr. and Mrs. FOSTER are to be made either to succumb or to walk the plank out of the GARRISON church.

The subject is quite worth pursuing, but



what we have written must suffice for the present. It is perhaps just as well to say, lest we should be hailed as a wicked partizan in this family quarrel, that we lean about equally to all sides.

#### AID FROM ABROAD TO DR. CHEEVER'S CHURCH

The airy and satirical article, copied from the *New York Independent*, respecting the mission of Miss JOHNSTONE, for raising money in Great Britain in sustentation of the Church of the Puritans, certainly puts a somewhat different face upon the subject from that given to it in our article in last week's paper upon the same subject. At that writing, we had supposed from the open and apparently authoritative manner in which Miss JOHNSTONE's mission was conducted, and from the well known fact that Mr. CHEEVER's church had lost some of its leading members an account of his persistent and earnest advocacy of the abolition of slavery, we did not doubt that the mission had been planned and was being carried out with the entire consent and under the direct sanction of both the church and its pastor; but if the *Independent*, a paper which ought to be well informed, speaks truly, the whole thing is a libel, a slander upon both the church and its minister. It may be small consolation to us in the dilemma in which that article places us; but such as it is, we accept it gratefully; that if we have been deceived respecting Miss JOHNSTONE's movements abroad, we are so in company with the *New York Anti-Slavery Standard*, the *Boston Liberator*, and several intelligent speakers at the late anti-slavery meetings in New York City, where the matter was freely and openly spoken of, in the very presence of the Puritan Church itself. The facts set forth respecting the pecuniary ability of the Church of the Puritans are forcibly put, and if not explained by other facts not stated by the *Independent*, they will do much where known to hinder the success of the mission of Miss JOHNSTONE, if they do not defeat it altogether. We are persuaded, however, that the *Independent* takes a narrow view of the benevolent object of Miss JOHNSTONE. There is nothing 'humiliating' in calling upon the whole universe for help to carry on the struggle against American slavery—certainly nothing improper in calling upon the Christian people of Great Britain to assist in putting down such a monster of extra wickedness. It is the commonest thing in the world for those who are like minded, to call upon each other for assistance in promoting an object they mutually believe to be a righteous and Christian object. The doctrine that the strong should help bear the infirmities of the weak, is a most precious and highly useful Christian doctrine, and one which can be reduced to practice without any undue exaltation on the one hand, or degradation on the other. It cannot be denied that in his Christian anti-slavery labors, Dr. CHEEVER has met with anything but the cordial sympathy of the denomination to which he belongs; and that he is at this moment but feebly supported by any evangelical church or press in this country, and, therefore, should he see fit to ask the friends of the slave in Great Britain and Ireland to assist him by their sympathy and money, he could do so with good cause, and without humiliation either to himself or to his church.

We rather relish the manner in which the *Independent* puts its foot upon the attempt of

Mr. CHESSON to make capital for a certain sect, out of the popularity of Dr. CHEEVER in England, representing that sect as the special champion of Dr. CHEEVER, while it is notorious here that its members are denouncing him as among the most dangerous foes which the anti-slavery cause has to meet. If this is 'support,' Dr. CHEEVER has received it in large measure, and with much apparent heartiness.

But, as to the mission of Miss JOHNSTONE, if that good lady has been duly authorized to act the part of a good Samaritan for the Church of the Puritans, or for Dr. CHEEVER, it is urgently proper that the fact should be at once frankly and fully stated; and if, on the other hand, Miss JOHNSTONE is placing the church or its pastor in a false light before the Christian people of England, that fact should be made known.

Meanwhile, it may be said that the donations made by the church, as stated by the *Independent*, do not, by any manner of means, prove that the church is not now in a needy condition, or that it does not deserve assistance.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

SYRACUSE, JUNE 8, 1859.

DEAR FRIEND:—I wish to acknowledge in your paper the following kind favors from friends of the slave in the Old World:

From Liverpool L. A. S. Society..... £10  
" Berwick-on-Tweed " ..... 4

In behalf of the fugitives that call on me in search of liberty, I thank these kind ladies for their remembrance of my poor people in their distress and troubles. These donations were sent to me by our kind and ever true friend, Mrs. Julia G. Crofts, whose friendship to my poor enslaved people I shall ever feel thankful for. May the Lord bless her with a long and happy life is my wish. I would have acknowledged these donations sooner, had I not been absent from home talking for the slave, and trying to do something for my Book, which I hope to make a means of doing good for the cause of the slave and the Underground Railroad.

Yours, as ever, J. W. LOGUEN,  
General Agent of the U. G. R. R.,  
in Syracuse, New York.

The Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia Press concedes that Sec'y Thompson, of the Interior Department, has faithfully endeavored to enforce the laws against the African slave-trade, and that his want of success is owing to the adverse public sentiment in many Southern localities. He says: "I understand that letters have lately been received from certain Southern Government officials, detailing the difficulties, and even dangers they have had to encounter in braving public sentiment, in regard to the slave traffic."

The Louisville Courier has the following item: "Reese, the free negro, who instituted the suit to regain his wife and children, whom he purchased from W. O. Smith, now deceased, and which were illegally withheld from him, has gained his suit in the Circuit Court. The case was argued at length, yesterday, and given to the jury, who returned a verdict after a brief consultation. The verdict was consistent with the testimony, and proper and right."

William Sanborn, James Christian and David L. Garrett, election judges of the 1st Ward, Cleveland, at the last city election, have been sued in the Common Pleas Court by Freeman H. Morris, tailor, who is slightly tinged with negro blood, for having refused to let him vote at that election. The damages are laid at \$1,000.

#### THE CRUELTY OF SOUTHERN SLAVERY.

Some months since a free colored man named Manuel Mason, resident in the District of Columbia, was imprisoned on a charge of *harboring his own son*, a slave lad, whose mistress suspected the father of having aided the child to run away. In the correspondence of the *New York Evening Post* we find a brief recapitulation of the story, and its sequel, and we copy it entire. Read this simple narrative of facts, gentlemen, and then perhaps you will write and publish here in New England fresh defences from the New York Tract Society, which dares not rebuke such sins and shames as these, which are the legitimate offspring of American Slavery. This is the sad story in brief:—

"Manuel Mason and his wife were the slaves of a white woman, living a few miles out of the city. A few years ago Manuel was taken sick with inflammatory rheumatism, and was given up by the doctors as incurable.—Under these circumstances his mistress offered to sell him for \$300. Nobody would touch him at that price.

Finally she offered to give the cripple his freedom for \$300, he to pay her in installments. He accepted the offer, and paid off the entire sum in due course of time. He partially recovered his health and hired the time of his wife for so much a year, that she might keep house for him in Washington. They raised a number of children at their own expense, but invariably at the age of about ten years the mistress took away each child and sold it off or appropriated it to her own use.

At last only one child was left—"little Ben." He was, like all youngest children, a favorite—the baby—the comfort of the old man and woman.

In September last one of our new police approached the small dwelling of Manuel Mason in search of 'little Ben,' for the last child must be taken to minister to the voracious appetite of the monster, Slavery. Benjamin was missing, however. The father never had him in his power or possession for one moment, yet he was suddenly arrested for 'harboring a slave!' The law dates 1707, under which he was taken, and the literal penalty is 'one hundred pounds of tobacco per hour' for each hour harboring a slave. You will perceive that the father was simply guilty of not finding his runaway boy.

The officer told Mason to hunt up his boy, and upon his neglecting to do this he was thrown into jail. Although no evidence was offered against him, yet the Justice would not let Mason out on any less bail than \$1500, which was furnished by a kind hearted citizen of the district. A jury very quickly brought in a verdict of guilty, though with no more evidence of guilt than is to be found in this letter. Mason was remanded to jail, where for days he lay without a bed, and all the time with scant clothing. He lay in jail forty-nine days before Judge Crawford would deign to sentence him. The sentence was to pay a fine of \$166,66; being \$1,66 for every hour the slave was harbored—one-half of said amount to go to the use of the owner of the slave, and the other half to the United States. I quote from the Judge's sentence as reported in the *National Intelligencer*. Mason was also sentenced to pay all costs, and to remain in jail till the entire sum was paid! The District Attorney was at last prevailed upon to consent, upon ample security that the money would be paid at the end of three months, to let the poor negro go, and he is at liberty once more. In the meantime a petition is circulating asking the President to remit the fine; but without a shadow of hope of success."

The Supreme Court of Michigan has affirmed the decision of an inferior court, that a woman has a perfect right to control in all respects the property acquired by her before or after marriage, that belongs to her, independent of her husband.



**MR. JAY'S REVIEW OF MR. LORD'S ARGUMENT BEFORE THE TRACT SOCIETY.**

**DANIEL LORD, Esq.**—**SIR:** At the recent anniversary meeting of the Directors of the Tract Society, I, as a life-director of that body, submitted to them without debate a Preamble and Resolution, which you opposed in an elaborate speech, at the conclusion of which your deliberately deprived me of the opportunity of saying a syllable in reply.—I quote the proceedings as reported in the *Herald*:

"On motion the Society then took a recess to enable the Directors to elect by ballot the Executive Committee.

While members were preparing their ballots, considerable discussion of the slave-trade resolutions was going on among members. Mr. John Jay inquired when it would be in order to offer a resolution before the directors, and the President replied that he could do so as soon as the election was over.

The President announced the result of the election. \* \* \* The announcement was received with applause.

Mr. JOHN JAY said as a life-director, he wished to offer the following resolution to the Board of Directors:

*Whereas*, It was unanimously and solemnly resolved by this Society, in 1857, after long and careful deliberation, and in accordance with the unanimous Report of a Committee of Fifteen, that those moral duties that grow out of the existence of slavery, as well as those moral evils and vices that spring from the institution, undoubtedly do fall within the province of this Society, and may and ought to be discussed in a fraternal and Christian spirit; and *Whereas*, at the meeting of the Society in 1858 the omission of the Publishing Committee to perform the said duty during the year then passed was reported with a special apology at said time, and said Report was accepted; and *Whereas*, no sufficient reasons are offered to the Society for their prolonged neglect to perform said duty, and there are urgent reasons why it should be performed:—therefore,

*Resolved*, That the Publishing Committee be instructed to publish during the coming year one or more tracts on the sin and evils of slavery:

The reading of the resolution was frequently interrupted by hisses and outcries. At the close Mr. Jay handed the paper to the Secretary, saying, 'I submit it without debate.'

**DANIEL LORD, Esq.**—**MR. PRESIDENT,** I oppose this resolution in no spirit of unfriendliness or hostility to those gentlemen who differ from the views I entertain.

In conclusion he moved that the motion of Mr. Jay to instruct the Publishing Committee be laid upon the table, adding, 'and then, when this meeting adjourns, as I suppose it will very soon, I trust that it never will be heard of any more except in the lamentations for its failure.' [Tremendous applause.]

**THE CHAIR**—The question is on laying the resolution on the table.

**MR. JAY**—Will Mr. Lord withdraw his motion for a moment?

**MR. LORD**—No, Mr. Jay, I will not. [Renewed cheers and shouts of 'Sit down!' 'Gag law!' etc.]

The motion to lay on the table was then put and declared carried.

Before entering upon the review of your argument, which I propose now to make, let me say a word of your refusal to allow me then to answer it.

I submitted the resolution without debate, for it explained itself, reserving, of course, my right to reply to any objection that might be urged against it. You opposed the resolution in a careful argument upon the objects, powers, scope, and policy of the Society—a speech whose wide range, extending even to the discussion of the principles involved in the Proxy Bill recently before our State Legislature, was unchecked by interruption or impatience. Speaking with an air of calm assur-

ance and perfect fairness, disclaiming, in advance all unfriendliness and discussing the doctrine of trust powers as connected with the constitution of the Society in legal phrase, and apparently with the impartiality of a judge, you were listened to with that respectful attention which was due to your reputation as a jurist and to your character as a man.

In the course of your remarks, you broached new and startling propositions in regard to the relative powers and duties of the Members and Directors of the Society on the one side, and the Executive Committee on the other. You declared that the former could no more instruct the latter than the people could instruct a judge whom they had elected. You elevated the Managers to the position of absolute dictators, blending in their own persons all powers legislative and judicial as well as executive, and you reduced the Directors and Members after the election of their officers to the merest ciphers, with no right to utter the voice or to declare the policy of the Society. You at the same time intimated that the position of the members being merely that of trustees, forbade the idea of their delegating that trust or acting by proxy even in the depositing of a ballot, and you wound up by sitting yourself in judgment upon the whole Society, and denouncing "as a gross usurpation" their action in 1857, referred to in the preamble of my resolutions;—an action unanimously recommended by fifteen eminent gentlemen after a year's deliberation, and unanimously adopted by the Society, without a murmur of dissent.

It caused no little surprise when, after so elaborate and decided an exposition of your views on behalf of the Management, and such a wholesale condemnation of the action of the Society at large, you concluded your speech with a motion to lay the resolution on the table; frankly declaring that your intention in so doing was to cut off all response, and replying to my appeal, respectfully made, that you would withdraw your motion for a moment to allow me a word, "No, Mr. Jay, I will not."

Your reply, which hardly exhibited your usual fairness and courtesy, made it evident that you had spoken on behalf of the Managers, and that neither they nor you were disposed to allow their cause to be damaged by any correction of your statements of fact, or any refutation of fallacies in your argument.—Desperate cases, it is said, require desperate remedies, and the length to which an advocate may allowably go in behalf of a client, is a question which every lawyer must determine for himself.

There is a well-known English authority which some, it is true, have more than questioned, but which, if the Managers of the Tract Society accept it as in accordance with "Evangelical Christianity and sound morality," fully justifies them and their advocates in appropriating to themselves, at the public anniversaries, the fullest privilege of speech, in indulging in personalities and denunciations, and accusing their opponents of "gross usurpation," and then instantly closing the door of debate and refusing to hear the other side.

Lord Brougham has said that "the advocate in the discharge of that office knows but one person in the world, that client and none other. That to save that client by all expedient means, to protect that client at all hazards and costs to all others, and among others to himself, is the highest and most unquestioned of his duties; and he must not regard the alarm, the suffering, the torment, the destruction, which he may bring upon any other.—Nay, separating even the duties of a patriot from those of an advocate, and casting them, if need be, to the wind, he must go on, reckless of the consequences, if his fate should unhappily be to involve his country in confusion, for his client's protection."

This rule, if you regard it a sound one, undoubtedly justified your attempt as the advocate of the Managers to close the mouths of all of the life members and directors of the Tract Society whose views did not accord with your own; and as your learned associate

in the defense of the Managers, Mr. Hiram Ketchum, pursued precisely the same policy, assuming for himself on a similar resolution touching the African slave trade the largest latitude of debate, and the liberty of direct personal allusion, not simply by glance but by name, and then following your example closed with a motion that cut off reply: and yet again attempted to stay Dr. Bacon in his argument by withdrawing the amendment to which Dr. Bacon was speaking,—it was evident to the house, and it is now understood by the public at large, that the efforts of Mr. Ketchum and yourself to retain in your own hands the whole of the discussion, and to compel your opponents to silence by what I must frankly say seemed to me a perversion of parliamentary fairness and parliamentary courtesy, were the tactics deliberately resorted to, under the exigencies of the case, and for the reason that by our putting the question of the duty of the Managers in the simple form presented by this and the subsequent resolutions, the Managers, as Dr. Spring phrased it, had found themselves "in a very narrow place."

I well remember, Sir, that some three years ago, when the citizens of New York had assembled to express their indignation at the cowardly hand which prostrated in the Senate our noble countryman and my own dear friend CHARLES SUMNER,—whom may God soon restore to us in his olden vigor—you addressed them in an animated speech, in which, with scathing force, you stigmatized the conduct of those Senators who offered no opposition to the assassin while striking his base blow, not at the rights of one Senator, but at the independence of all the Senators. You declared in reference to their privilege of debate: "It is not *their* privilege, it is *my* privilege, it is *your* privilege, it is *our* privilege;" and you concluded a manly and effective address by enjoining your countrymen to "remember that nothing is of greater or higher importance to the country than to preserve freedom of speech and of debate in our legislative bodies against every attempt to subvert it."

I cannot but regret that the lesson you then taught to the country, should seem to have been forgotten by yourself, and that the influence of your character and example should have been given even in the capacity of counsel, to the suppression of fair debate on an occasion and on a subject where you had shown, by your own elaborate and very skillful argument, that debate was legitimate and proper.

It is always easy for a managing majority who are ready to condescend to such a maneuver, especially when they are aided by a convenient chairman, to gag an opposing minority, and to exult in their anticipated lamentations over the fate of smothered resolutions. It is a game that for long years was played in the House of Representatives with at least as much skill as the Executive Committee of the Tract Society can hope to exhibit, from the presentation of the first anti-slavery petition more than twenty years ago; but the success that has attended political attempts, by gag-laws, to stay the beating of the public heart on the question of slavery, one would suppose has hardly been such as to encourage its repetition in religious associations, and with such an audience as that assembled at the Academy. Whether or not they could all follow and understand your legal argument, they could not fail to understand your refusal to allow a reply to it. Americans, like their English ancestors, are fond of fair play, and although an unscrupulous faction and a partisan press may applaud the clever device that smothers debate, and enables a speaker under its cautious cover, to strike powerful blows and utter sweeping charges and indulge in sarcasm, shielded and sheltered from a single blow in return, it is not to be supposed that conduct which would not be tolerated in circles of far less pretension, will command the approval of the American public, when exhibited by the management of an institution for the promotion of "Evangelical Christianity and sound morality."

Already murmurs are heard, even from the



presses most friendly to the managers, and most hostile to the introduction of the slavery question into the publications of the Society. The *Times* editorially remarks, (May 14th:) "Those efforts (to induce the Tract Society to publish against the evils of slavery) must not be met in the spirit and by the weapons wielded by the dominant party at the meeting of Wednesday last. The weapons were carnal and the temper devilish. The same exhibition at a political meeting would have been deemed disgraceful, and just cause of alarm for the liberties of the country."

The *Courier and Enquirer* also expresses itself with almost similar force in regard to the folly of the attempt "to suppress by clamor and violence" the utterance of those who wished the Society to condemn the slave trade. I cannot help thinking, Sir, that Mr. Ketchum and yourself have unwittingly assisted, to the greatest extent, the cause which you opposed, and damaged equally that which you advocated, by the attempts to monopolize the discussion and allow no reply to your arguments and assertions. *Audi alteram partem* expresses the instinctive feeling of every honest and intelligent assembly, and an argument on one side, where the party making it carefully cuts off reply from the other side, will seldom carry conviction.

Your anticipation that the matter was ended with your resolution, and would never again be heard of, was answered by the introduction of similar resolutions almost before the Academy had ceased to echo with your voice; and your assertion that "the members had no power but to elect officers" was met by the vote of the house on the resolution of Dr. Spring, denouncing the slave trade and deprecating its revival. So far from indulging in lamentation over the fate of a resolution thus disposed of, its fate inspires not simply hope but confidence. That man is a novice in American politics who has not learned that the course that requires to be bolstered by the suppression of debate is already lost. The party that shrinks from allowing a reply to its arguments has confessed its weakness, and the confession is noted by the world; and the main assumption of your speech, that the managers are the Society, and that the members are ciphers, and that the Society in 1857 were guilty "of a gross usurpation" in determining what were their rights and their duties in regard to slavery, is already felt by the public at large to be one so singularly at variance with common sense and common practice that it was not without reason you shrink from its being answered.

The charge thus made by you is not a light one. It is a wholesale impeachment of the wisdom and the judgment—not of myself, for I had nothing to do with the matter—but of the Committee of Fifteen who reported the resolutions, and of the entire body of members, directors, and managers by whom they were unanimously adopted. Upon such an indictment it is clear that they had a right to be heard before being summarily condemned, and as, since the meeting in question, you have again brought the matter before the public, by re-writing your speech for publication, and it is put forth as an authoritative exposition of the principles that lie at the basis not only of the Tract Society, but of other associations having a similar foundation, I propose to examine the correctness of your premises, the soundness of your argument and the justness of your conclusion.

I agree with you that there has been a gross usurpation, but I think it has been a usurpation not by the Society against their servants, the managers, but on the part of the managers on the rights and principles of the Society, their master.

I believe I can make it clear that your clients, the Executive Committee, have violated authoritative instructions which they were morally bound to observe; that they find their excuses for disobedience, based upon the opposition of the South and the constitutional requirement that their tracts shall be such as to meet the approbation of all Evangelical Christians, have been rendered too transparent

to serve any longer the purpose; and that, as a last and desperate resort, they have suddenly hit upon the novel idea, whose discovery you announced at the Academy, that the instructions are void for want of authority, and that neither excuse nor apology is required, for their being violated deliberately and treated with contempt.

That the character of these resolutions which you now, for the first time, and with such grave solemnity, have denounced as "a gross usurpation," or as in your revised speech "a great usurpation," on the rights of the Executive Committee, may be fully understood, it is proper to refer to the circumstance under which they were adopted, as it will appear that the action now complained of by the Executive Committee as unconstitutional, was suggested and invited by themselves.

In 1852 a Congregational Union in Illinois addressed a letter to the Society, in which they remarked, "We feel sure that the time has come when the continued absence from the publications of your Society, of all that relates to slavery will be significant; that silence can no longer be neutrality or indifference, and that a tract literature which speaks less plainly of slavery than of other specific evils, will conduce to a defective, partial, and unsound morality."

To this letter a reply was made by the Secretary, Rev. R. S. Cook, in which he based the refusal of the Society to allude to slavery upon the constitutional requirement that all tracts should be calculated to meet the approbation of all Evangelical Christians, and concluded with declaring that "the course of duty seems plain before us, to adhere as a Society to the simple Gospel in its essential saving truths."

As the Society, however, did not regard the constitutional requirement—their conscientious adherence to which forbade them to say a syllable against slavery—as confining them to the "simple Gospel" to the exclusion of other matters,—but as leaving them at perfect liberty to announce the divine wrath against sundry habits which they had no hesitation in denouncing as crimes, although not so regarded by all evangelical Christians—such as reading novels, playing cards, selling and drinking wine, dancing, smoking, snuffing, and chewing tobacco, and going to a circus, a theater, or a horse race, the reasoning of Mr. Cook, considered in connection with the daily practice of the managers, so far from satisfying the public mind, deepened the conviction that the refusal to publish tracts against the monstrous evils inherent in slavery, was rather due to some peculiar sympathy with slavery, or its supporters, than to the extreme and holy scrupulousness claimed for them by Mr. Cook.

"The agitation," I quote from a pamphlet by Judge Jay, "continued and increased, and new intensity was given to it by the conduct of Rev. Nehemiah Adams, D. D., one of the Publishing Committee, and as such possessing an absolute veto on every tract offered for publication. This reverend gentleman had published a labored vindication of American slavery, excusing and extenuating each of its abominations, and in its sneering, jeering tone highly insulting to such of his fellow Christians as had been zealous in exposing the iniquities of the slave system." At length the officers of the Society became alarmed, and as the opponents of its policy had intimated an intention of procuring the appointment of a Committee to consider and report upon the policy they were pursuing, the Executive Committee at the last hour offered to facilitate such an inquiry, and the following resolution was passed by the Society:

"Regarding the action and proceedings of the Executive Committee as frankly and ingenuously inviting the fullest investigation into all the affairs committed to their care,—Therefore, *Resolved*, that at the suggestion of the Executive Committee themselves a special Committee of Fifteen be appointed to inquire into and review the proceedings of the Executive Committee, and report to the next annual meeting to be duly convened, or to a

special meeting to be called by the said Committee at their discretion."

The acting members of this Committee were Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, Rev. Thomas De Witt D. D., New York, Hon. William Jessup of Pennsylvania, Rev. Albert Barnes of Philadelphia, Rev. Francis Wayland, D. D., of Rhode Island, Rev. Gregory T. Bedell, D. D., of New York, Rev. John S. Stone, D. D., of Massachusetts, Rev. John N. McLeod, D. D., of New York, James Donaldson, Esq., of New York, George H. Stuart, Esq., of Philadelphia, Rev. Joel Hawes, D. D., of Hartford, Rev. Ray Palmer, D. D., of Albany, Rev. S. S. Schmucker, D. D., of Pennsylvania, Rev. Mark Hopkins, D. D., of Massachusetts.

"They were men," as the Executive Committee themselves remarked, "of highest influence in the churches, and whose names had many of them most justly a currency and weight far beyond our national limits."

This Committee in the year 1857 reported unanimously the resolutions in question, which were unanimously adopted by the Society at a very large meeting, and which I reproduce in full to enable us the more readily to judge of the justice of your charge that they were "an act of gross usurpation."

"In relation to publishing upon the subject of slavery, the Committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, as marking out the line of discrimination between what the American Tract Society, according to its constitution, may and may not publish:

*Resolved*, 1. That the American Tract Society was established for a definite purpose, namely, "to diffuse a knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of sinners, and to promote the interests of vital godliness and sound morality by the circulation of religious tracts calculated to receive the approbation of all evangelical Christians."

2. That this Society cannot, therefore, with propriety allow itself to be made a special organ of any one system of religious or moral reform, such as temperance, peace, anti-popery, anti-slavery, etc; while within its proper sphere, its influence should sustain the cause of truth and righteousness in all their departments.

3. That in endeavoring to accomplish its high and holy mission, the Society should deal even-handedly, and bear impartial testimony against all forms of fundamental doctrinal error and practical immorality, prevailing in any and every part of our country.

4. That in the judgment of your Committee, the political aspects of slavery lie entirely without the proper sphere of this Society, and cannot be discussed in its publications; but that those moral duties which grow out of the existence of slavery, as well as those moral evils and vices which it is known to promote, and which are condemned in Scripture, and so much deplored by evangelical Christians, undoubtedly do fall within the province of this Society, and can and ought to be discussed in a fraternal and Christian spirit.

5. That whatever considerations in the past may have seemed to recommend to the Publishing Committee the course pursued in its revision of certain works, yet in the future publication of books and tracts, no alteration or omission of the sentiments of any author should be made; but works not adapted to the design of the Society in their original form, or by a regular impartial abridgment, should be wholly omitted.

6. That we gratefully acknowledge the favor of Divine Providence in the blessing which has rested upon the American Tract Society, in its onward progress of success and prosperity, and the beneficent influence it has exerted upon our country and the world.

7. That we cordially recognize the fidelity and devotedness with which the interests of the Society have been superintended and conducted by the officers and Executive Committee, five of the present members having been among its original founders.

8. That with great confidence in the wis-



dom of the Executive Committee, we anticipate that their action, in carrying out the principles contained in the previous resolutions will be such as will tend to promote the widest and best usefulness of this Society throughout our whole country."

The Executive Committee elected at the Anniversary meeting of 1857, so far from regarding this action of the Society, embracing as it did the joint action of the life-members, the life-directors, and the Executive Committee themselves, who were included in the one class or the other, as a "gross usurpation" on their own authority, accepted it as embodying instructions which they were bound to obey, and as the action of a body who were constitutionally authorized to instruct them.

In 1858 they submitted a Special Report unanimously signed by the Publishing and Executive Committees, proffering an apology for the non-performance of the duty imposed upon them—an apology that was based not upon any question of the clear right of the Society to instruct the Executive Committee, or of the clear duty of the Committee to obey such instruction, but altogether upon special reasons separate and apart from the question of authority. This will appear most distinctly from the language used by them.

They submitted that they had found a new state of things existing in the South, in regard to the subject, from that anticipated by the Committee, and that as the last resolution "certainly intimated that SOME SCOPE AND RANGE WERE ALLOWED THEIR JUDGMENT, as to the time and measures of action," (they claimed neither scope nor range as to the principles.) \* \* \* "there was a complicated knot and entanglement in the instructions of the report"—and next they refer to an alleged variance in the intentions of one member of the Committee and those of the other members, and remark, (the italics and capitals are their own) "*The animus imponentis*, or the intention of the ENACTING BODY, is an important question in casuistry with regard to a new law, and that question in this case becomes, what was the purpose of THE SOCIETY, not of the Committee of Fifteen, but the Society, at its annual meeting on adopting that report, and in sending down to the officers and Executive Committee these resolutions? THAT SOCIETY is the party laying on us or imposing these instructions. What as a Society did they intend?"

\* \* \* "But to pass from these considerations, the Publishing Committee and the Executive Committee, of which they form a part, were but a SUBORDINATE BODY, cast on this new state of affairs, etc. \* \* \* It is in all cases of subordinate agents exercising a vague and disputed power a SAFE AND HONORED RULE THAT THE ACTION OF THE SUBORDINATES SHOULD AS FAR AS POSSIBLE AVOID INNOVATION, AND LEAVE ANY EMERGING QUESTION at stake to remain unaffected by their subordinate acts, and to be in its integrity reserved for the DECISION OF THE HIGHER POWER APPOINTING THEM.—Here the Society is such superior power." \* \* \* "If it (a rupture between North and South) must be made, is it not better that it should be done deliberately, with full knowledge, and by the body having the moral right?"

Thus much from the minute of the Publishing Committee, which was adopted by the Executive Committee in a report in which they remark in the same strain:

"The Publishing and Executive Committee were but a SUBORDINATE BODY, acting with limited powers under a Society itself occupying by the constitution a platform of certain limits as to object and work. In case of doubt or debate as to the acts of subordinates, it is a rule of common morality, that if the power be doubtful, the act should not be, if it can be avoided, such as to be irrevocable. If the superior and appointing power have failed to give explicit instructions, his subordinate ought not to enter on any novel course which his superior, if dissatisfied, would be unable to reverse. By arresting publication, the Executive Committee saved the question entire and intact for the Society, the superior body.—" \* \* \* ACTION BY A SUBORDINATE in

such dubious cases, when INVOLVING RESULTS WHICH THE SUPERIOR BODY CANNOT RECALL, IS BUT THE UNWARRANTABLE ARROGATION OF POWERS NOT RIGHTFULLY GIVEN." p. 198.

The apology of the Executive Committee in 1858, thus skillfully and delicately made to rest in great part on their fear of arrogating powers that did not belong to them, and their desire to leave open the door for a reconsideration and renewal by the Society of the instructions to carry out the intent of the resolutions, the moment the Southern mind became more calm, or the occasion for action more urgent, was accepted, and on motion of Bishop McIlvaine the report was adopted.

Another year rolls round. The insolent impiety of slavery has grown more intolerable. The American slave-trade, with its multiplied auction-blocks, where even women are exposed to brutal examinations, mothers separated from their children, and husbands from their wives, and all the ties of human nature ruthlessly insulted, has aroused anew the indignation and disgust of Christendom. No single step toward the abolition or amelioration of slavery, or of its worst evils, has been taken by a single State. The Bible remains a sealed book. Marriage, as Judge Crawford recently declared from the Bench at Washington, is not recognized between slaves—the separation of families exists, if possible, to a yet greater extent than formerly from the increased value of slave labor, and the fate of the wretched millions who groan under the lash of brutal overseers seems more utterly rayless than ever. Not simply do the monied power of the land and the political power of the Democracy combine to extinguish hope, but the Southern pulpit following the lead of Northern divines with South-side views, claims for slavery the approval of heaven in this Republic, and in this latter half of the nineteenth century, as when Cowper's plaintive strain touched the heart of England—

"Trade, wealth, and fashion ask them still to bleed,  
And holy men give Scripture, for the deed."

The African slave-trade, whose final abolition was provided for by the Federal Constitution, and which, at the earliest moment allowed to Congress, was forbidden, and subsequently branded as piracy, punishable with death, has been revived by Southern slaveholders, and now defies the Federal laws and the moral sentiment of the nation, backed by a faithless pulpit, a hireling press, a conniving executive, convenient judges, and perjured jurors.

The slave-traders of the "Echo" are acquitted in the teeth of the clearest evidence. Congo negroes are advertised for sale in various parts of the South. Proclamation is made by eighteen planters of Mississippi under their own hands, offering so much per head for African negroes of varying age and sex, deliverable between the ports of Florida and Texas. Newspaper presses and political conventions declare that the trade "must be and shall be revived," and that "there are no considerations of justice and humanity applicable to the African trade which are not equally applicable to the institution of domestic slavery," and their seems no reason to doubt that at the present moment the olden slave-hunts are renewed in the kingdom of Dahomy to supply with slaves the newly opened American market, and that "Cargoes of Despair" are enduring the horrors of the middle passage before encountering the fearful lot that awaits them in the Republic of Washington. Under these circumstances, and remembering that the Tract Society had long given aid and comfort to the slaveholders by mutilating their reprints in behalf of both slavery and the slave-trade, and feeling that under existing circumstances silence was acquiescence, and acquiescence was partnership in guilt, I moved in the Board of Directors, on behalf of many life-members and directors, the preamble and resolution that you opposed, which, after reciting the resolution of 1857 and the apology of the Committee in 1858, proceeds:

"And whereas, no sufficient reason appears to the Society for their prolonged neglect to perform the said duty, but there are urgent

reasons why it should be performed;—

"Therefore, Resolved, That the Publishing Committee be instructed to publish, during the coming year, one or more tracts on the evils and vices that spring from slavery."

Forgetful of the main ground of their apology the last year, the Committee with singular facility place themselves in a reverse position, and allow you to plead for them, and support the plea by a learned argument, that the resolutions of 1857 were "a gross usurpation on their rights." Last year they, these same gentlemen, said they did not obey the resolution because they were a purely subordinate body, with very limited powers, and they were afraid, as obedience involved some doubtful results that it would imply on their part an unwarrantable arrogation of powers not rightfully belonging to them, and therefore they deemed it their duty to submit the matter to the reconsideration of the Society, the superior power.

This year they will not listen to the reconsideration of the matter either by the Society or the directors, for the reason that they, as they now assume, are the supreme Executive Committee, standing above and apart from the Society, giving orders but receiving none; and that the Society, stripped by some unexplained process of its inherent superiority, to which till now they have bowed with profound obedience, having expended its power in electing them, is bound to submit to their sovereign will, and has no more right to instruct them as to their duty than the people have to teach law to the judge whom they have elected to the bench. Accustomed as the public are to hear occasionally diverse and inconsistent pleas urged at the bar on behalf of indicted criminals, it is something new to hear pleas so absolutely contradictory gravely put forth by Christian gentlemen. And one may be pardoned for finding it difficult to follow them in their defense or clearly to understand their logic.

One thing, however, appears to be clear, that whether, according to their first plea, the managers are a subordinate body with no power, or whether, according to their new plea, which you have so elaborately argued on their behalf, they are a superior body with all the power, they do not intend to publish a line against slavery or the slave trade. And this, after all, is the vital point. If they have counted the cost, and have decided to betray the innocent blood of millions of their fellow men that cries from the savannahs of the South and the wilds of Africa; if they intend to bear by their silence, their omissions, and their mutilations, false witness in the name of "vital godliness and sound morality" in behalf of slavery and the slave trade, it is indeed but a trifling matter in view of the grand result of crime and guilt and direct moral responsibility,—whether, in regard to the pretended apologies for their complicity, their witness from year to year agreeth or not together.

As the elaborate apology of your clients in 1858 so completely answers and refutes your argument in their behalf in 1859, a careful analysis of it on my part might hardly be necessary, but I will refer to some important elements, as they seem to me, to a sound decision, that I observe with surprise are wholly omitted and overlooked in your discussion of the relative powers of the Society and the Committee. First, One of the lessons which I was taught by you when more than twenty years ago, I was so fortunate as to read law in your office, and to study under your guidance the elemental principles of jurisprudence, was never to base an opinion upon partial data, always to seek the highest sources of authority, and not to pronounce upon the powers or duties of a corporation without carefully examining the charter whence those rights and duties had arisen.

Remembering this rule, I look to the charter of the American Tract Society, granted in 1841, to which, singularly enough, you do not even refer, to discover who constitute the corporation and what is its object. It there appears that the corporation are not the Executive Committee nor the Board of Direct-



ors, but the members. "All such persons as now are or may hereafter become members of the American Tract Society, formed in the city of New York, in the year 1825, are constituted a body corporate by the name of the American Tract Society, for the purpose of printing and circulating religious publications."

Secondly, I submit that donors to the funds of the Society, under the plan set forth in the constitution, do not when they give thirty or fifty dollars, without special designation, to its funds, as you contend, make it "an entire gift, parting with their right as proprietors," for that donation, by the plan set forth in the constitution, entitles each donor—and this provision equally with the charter seems to have escaped your notice—so long as he shall live, to an annual dividend of a fixed pecuniary value, to be paid in tracts, calculated to promote the interests of vital godliness and sound morality. When, therefore, you describe the Society's funds as eminently a *Trust* property, and enumerate the disinterested motives that should secure its right management, you might have added that each member had, in view of his own beneficial interest in the fund as a proprietor, his own right to the annual dividend, or if he should prefer it, to a return at any time of 50 per cent. of the capital contributed, in the shape of religious tracts calculated to promote sound morality—a direct valuable personal interest in addition to his duty as a trustee, in the right administration of the Society and its publications, to the end that he may receive for his own use, and for circulation by his own hands, his annual dividends in the sterling coin of pure religion and sound morality, and not in any counterfeit currency such as we think has occasionally issued from the Society's mint.

If the Committee should believe, however conscientiously, that a bogus substitute is demanded for circulation in the slave States, and that the legitimate coin would there be rejected, that certainly constitutes no reason why the thousands and tens of thousands of members throughout the free States entitled by the constitution of the Society and the terms of their donations to regular issues of "Religious Tracts," should not be supplied with such tracts of an honest character, instead of the mutilated compilations which, fostering slavery and encouraging the slave trade, are, as we contend, corrupting our morals as a nation, by conveying the first principles of right and wrong and conveying the idea that evangelical Christianity is consistent with the daily practice of the worst of crimes.

It being admitted that anti-slavery tracts of the kind contemplated by my resolution, are in accordance with the constitutional objects of the Society, I submit, thirdly, that no alleged difficulty on the part of the Managers in the circulation at the South of tracts against slavery and the slave trade, constitutes a valid argument against the publication of such tracts for distribution among those members of the Society who are entitled to receive tracts, and desire to receive those of this character.

In the fourth place, since the members are, as I have shown, not simply trustees, as you contend, but also proprietors, with a direct personal interest constitutionally secured to them in the right management of the institution, the argument that they cannot delegate their discretion—for the reason that "they are mere trustees and have no power as proprietors"—falls to the ground.

The Legislature by the act of incorporation reserved the power to alter the act, and if they are satisfied that the rights of the 20,000 members, if the number is not still larger, scattered through the country, and unable to attend in person the annual meetings, require for their protection an act similar to that which was at the last session, adopted by the Assembly, by a vote of 69 to 21, and passed to a third reading in the Senate, enabling members to vote by proxy, it seems to me clear that such an enabling statute would be not only perfectly constitutional, but eminently proper. Had the attempt been made to induce the Society of its own motion, to adopt a by-law authorizing the members to vote by proxy, it might

have been open to the objection that such a by-law required legislative sanction to give it validity; but the right of the Legislature, in the exercise of its sovereign prerogatives under the constitution, to give that privilege to the members of a corporation which it has itself created by a charter which it reserves the right to alter or repeal at pleasure, is one against which I have yet to hear a valid objection.

In the fifth place, and now we come to the gist of your argument, that the resolutions of 1857 were "a gross usurpation" by the Society on the rights of the Executive Committee, I cannot admit your position, that "in looking into the constitution of the charter their (the members) only power and function is at their annual meeting to nominate and appoint the officers of the institution the effective managers of the charity." Looking at "the charter," we have found that the members are the corporation. They constitute the body politic at large. No directors, managers, or Executive Committee, are named in the charter or are therein intrusted with the authority, or any part of it, necessary to carry out the objects of the institution; and by virtue of their charter, the members constituting the corporate body have a right at common law and without any further statute, to make all laws not inconsistent with their charter, for the management of their business and property; for the accomplishment of the object of their foundation, and to regulate the duties and conduct of their officers and agents.—Now, have the members by the constitution they have adopted stripped themselves of this power given them by the State?

Article IV. provides that the Society shall meet annually on a fixed day, when the proceedings of the foregoing year shall be reported, and a Board, consisting of a President, Vice-President, Secretaries, a Treasurer, two Auditors, and thirty-six Directors, shall be chosen.

In this section, if any, is to be found the renunciation by the Society of all its inherent controlling power. Article V. prescribes the duties of the Board of Directors.

"The Board of Directors shall annually elect by ballot a Publishing, a Distributing, and a Finance Committee, each consisting of not less than three nor more than six members, the members of which three Committees shall constitute an EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE to conduct the business of the Society, and shall be *ex officio* members of the Board. The Board shall have power to enact by-laws and to appoint honorary Vice-Presidents, Directors or Members. Twelve members of the Board present at any meeting regularly convened, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business."

Your argument contends that the Society by electing its officers and agents, conveys to those officers and agents all of its own powers and functions, and therefore is powerless to order, instruct, direct, or advise.

You say—I quote from your speech as revised—

"He," the member, "has no power reserved to control those whom he has elected. The plan of the charity has confined the power of carrying out its purposes to those whom he has appointed. The members can no more interfere with the discretion of the officers by then nominated than those who elect judges can direct them what judgments they shall render."

With the most careful study of the charter and constitution of the Society, I confess myself unable to discover a shadow of argument in favor of this broad assertion. The election of officers and agents is one thing, their instruction is another. The Society provides for their election at a fixed time; it reserves the power of instructing them at all times. It confers upon them no exclusive grant of the original powers given to the members; there is not a word that intimates that the Society is *functus officio* when it has elected its officers. It provides, for, its own convenience, that there shall be a Board of Directors who shall appoint three Committees to constitute

"an Executive Committee" to conduct the business of the Society; and it is an unheard of claim that the officers and agents of the Society appointed to conduct its executive business, should contend that by the simple act of their appointment to do the business of the Society, they are elevated to a position superior to the Society, and endowed with an absolute discretion—and that the Society has, by their appointment, stripped itself of the right which, in common with every corporate body, it possesses at common law, "to regulate the duties and conduct of its agents."—As *The Journal of Commerce* remarks, in reference to your speech, "the principles which it sets forth, with so much clearness, are as applicable to other benevolent institutions which have money committed to their care for the purpose specified in their constitution, as it is to the American Tract Society; the subject is, therefore, of general interest." It may be that the executive servants of other corporations also may be inclined, in imitation of the Tract Society managers, by a *coup d'état* to throw off their allegiance to the appointing power, and declare themselves the masters and not the servants. But the very full committal of the directors of the Tract Society, in their last year's report, to the olden doctrine, that the Society, as the Superior Power, had a right to instruct; and they, as the subordinate, were bound to obey; the uniform practice of the Society for long years to declare, by its own vote at the Anniversary meetings, under the lead of the ablest and most conservative jurists of the country, the duty and the policy it should observe for the future; and the perfect fitness and propriety of the solemn action of the Society on the subject of slavery in the years 1856 and 1857—their careful choice of wise counselors—the calm deliberation and consultation of those counselors during the ensuing year—the moderation of their views—the impregnable strength of their conclusions,—and their unanimous adoption, by the entire Society, not only in its corporate capacity, but with the concurrence of all its branches, members, directors, and three committees, without a syllable of dissent from a single individual, crowned as the whole proceeding was by a public thanksgiving that they had been enabled, with such loving harmony, to determine and proclaim the line of duty prescribed to them by the objects of their foundation and the truths of Religion on the question of slavery, will forever give to that authoritative exposition of the duties of the Society a weight, a dignity and a power that no charge of usurpation now put forth, by men groping for an excuse to shirk their duty, will at all impair.

Sixthly, and this is the last point in your argument to which I shall refer, you allude to Article VI. of the constitution, which declares:

"To promote in the highest degree the object of this Society, the officers and directors shall be chosen from different denominations of Christians. The Publishing Committee shall contain no two members from the same ecclesiastical connection, and no tract shall be published to which any member of that Committee may object."

You contend that the absolute veto here given to each member of the Publishing Committee in regard to each tract renders idle the attempt of the Society to give any instruction whatever. You say that "the attempt to instruct the Committee assumes to take away not the veto of one but the discretion of all," and you add, "The plan of the charity has not in it such an inconsistency."

It is quite true that the plan of the charity involves no inconsistency, and that the right of general instruction on the part of the Society is in perfect accordance with the constitutional exercise of the veto power by the members of the Publishing Committee. And had you, Sir, been familiar with the past controversies on the subject of the Tract Society and slavery, I do not think you would again have quoted the clause as restricting the constitutional right of the Society to declare its duty on questions of morality.



When the charter was granted in 1841, it was upon a petition from the Society setting forth that it was formed for "promoting the interests of vital godliness and sound morality by the circulation of religious tracts calculated to receive the approval of Evangelical Christians of different denominations."

Here we see that *denominational standards*, and not the opinions of one or more individuals, were to be the test of approval. "The Society was formed," said Judge Jay—the soundness of whose expositions of this point I have never seen any attempt to refute—"as intimated by its constitution, for the purpose of promoting Christian faith and Christian practice by the publication of religious tracts. But all Christians are not of the same faith—hence their division into distinct denominations, defining in creeds and standards the doctrines they severally hold. On comparing these creeds, certain important doctrines are found to be contained in many of them.—These doctrines thus held alike in common by many Protestant denominations are called Evangelical, and those holding them are called Evangelical Christians." The Society was formed by persons claiming this appellation, and it was agreed that the doctrines to be inculcated should be those only held in common by the denominations to which they severally belonged. To secure fidelity to this agreement, each member of the Publishing Committee was given a veto on every tract, and no two members could belong to the same denomination. The tracts were to be calculated to receive the approbation of all Evangelical Christians—that is, of all who held the Evangelical doctrines. The denominations represented in the Committee are understood to be the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Baptist, Methodist, Dutch Reformed, and the Calvinistic Congregational. Of course no tract can constitutionally conflict with anything contained in the standards of these sects, and this is all that can be rationally understood as required by the provision respecting the approbation of *all* Evangelical Christians. Questions of doctrine are settled by reference to creeds and standards, but not questions of morals.

The idea that, on questions of morals no tract shall be issued calculated to meet the approbation of all Evangelical Christians, is one which the Society and the Publishing Committee have from the day of their organization utterly repudiated. They have unsparingly condemned dancing schools for children, the reading of novels, attending horse-races, visiting the circus, "fashionable amusements," drinking wine and beer, wearing costly apparel, and smoking and chewing tobacco, although they know perfectly well that these things are approved and practiced by many whom they recognize as Evangelical Christians, if indeed they not approve and practice some of these so-called vices themselves.

Their own interpretation, therefore, of the constitution renders untenable the argument at this day that they cannot condemn the evils inherent in slavery and the slave-trade, because these evils are approved by men whom they recognize as Evangelical Christians.—Should any member of the Publishing Committee use the veto intrusted to him by the Society to prevent any violation in the tract of the agreement for a conformity to denominational standards of doctrine, in order to shield from rebuke slavery and piracy, it would be a fraudulent perversion of the power given to him for an excellent purpose. And I submit that with this clear understanding of the object of the veto and of the practical interpretation put by the Society itself on the meaning of the constitution, there is nothing in the authority given to the Publishing Committee, absolute as it may seem, that in any degree derogates from the right and the duty of the Society to direct its influence in the promotion of a sound morality against any vice or crime, however popular; inasmuch as the constitution did not intend the veto of the members of the Publishing Committee to be interposed save for the preservation of good faith and the better accomplishment of the objects of the Society, and its exercise for

any other purpose would be a moral perjury, and such a contingency is not to be presumed.

However the Executive Committee may desire to alter the character of the Society and to change their recorded views of the constitution, to arrogate to themselves authority which they have so expressively disclaimed, and to override the solemn will of the power by whom they were appointed, and to whom, by their own admission, they owe allegiance, I need not say that we who desire to see the duty of the Society on the subject of slavery as efficiently performed as it was unanimously declared, do not propose to change our position or to acquiesce in the new doctrines of the supremacy of the Executive Committee, which have, as we think, no basis in the charter—none in the constitution—none in the uniform practice of the body—and none in the antecedents, arguments and acts of the managers. We believe, Sir, conscientiously, that our acquiescence in the view you have contended for, would not only be an abandonment of our rights, but a violation of our duty. We broach no new theory—we introduce no abstract question—we ask not the Society to swerve one line from the path which its wise and reverend counselors, its divines and jurists, whose fame is more than national, have with such deliberate caution marked out as that which the objects of the foundation require them to walk in. From this our stand-point, occupying no "narrow place," but standing upon the broad charter of the Society, and upon their unanimous resolution of 1857, whose supreme authority the managers have emphatically indorsed, we are not now to be driven by the cry from the managers of interference and "gross usurpation."

If the Executive Committee have changed their views, if they now repudiate the principles of those resolutions which they openly approved in 1857, if they have determined that they cannot conscientiously, as the executive servants of the Society, carry those principles into practice; or if from any reason whatever they are decided that they will not reduce them to practice, nor issue a single tract upon "those moral duties which grow out of the existence of slavery, or upon the moral evils and vices which it is known to promote, and which are condemned in Scripture, and so much deplored by Evangelical Christians," and which the Society has unanimously resolved "do fall within the province of the Society, and can and ought to be discussed in a fraternal and Christian spirit;" if they are thus resolved, why should they not retire from a position which they can no longer hold consistently with the interests of the Society or their own honor—why cling to offices with duties attached to them, which duties, on one pretense or another, they seem determined to shirk? Had they frankly said before their election, We will not again accept office unless the resolutions of 1857 are repealed; we will not act as your Executive Committee with those definite instructions unrevoked, there would have been at least some frankness in the announcement; but to accept the offices, knowing the recorded views of the Society and the position it had openly taken before the world, compelling action on its part as a matter of duty, and then, the next moment after they were elected, hastening to declare themselves independent of the Society's will, and to denounce their avowal of principles as an act of usurpation, entitled to neither obedience nor respect—such a course involves questions of propriety which the American people, without being versed in charters or learned in law, can perfectly understand and appreciate.

The managers are not alone in preferring charges against laws which they are unwilling to obey. At the very time when on their behalf you were denouncing as "gross usurpation" on the rights of the Executive Committee the unanimous action of the Society, in its corporate capacity, on the subject of slavery; the slaveholders of the South, assembled at Vicksburg, were denouncing as a "gross usurpation" on their rights, that action

of the framers of our Federal Constitution and the subsequent action of the Federal Congress, which declared the slave-trade to be a felony punishable with death.

As the Executive Committee assume that slavery is in accordance with Evangelical Christianity, the Vicksburg gentlemen assume and declare that "it was God's policy to open the slave-trade," that "it was a Christian duty and an act of humanity," and that if it were treason to re-open the trade "peaceably if they could, forcibly if they must, there were 200,000 citizens of Mississippi whose necks were ready for the halter." (Speech of Mr. Bennett.) And Mr. Senator Foote led his hearers to believe that they "would soon have slaves in Oregon, in Washington Territory, in Southern California, in Arizona, and in the yet to be acquired territories of Chihuahua, Sonora and Sinaloa."

With such a destiny presented to us by the abettors of slavery and the slave-trade, was it extravagant language—that contained in my resolution that "no sufficient reasons are offered to the Society for the prolonged neglect to perform their duty, but there are urgent reasons why it should be performed?"

The war now commencing or commenced in Europe, based upon the quarrels of monarchs rather than the rights of the people, may command to a far greater extent the attention of the world than the war now being waged in this country for humanity and freedom on the one side, and slavery and the slave-trade on the other—a war, the issue of which will decide the character and destiny of America, the meaning and progress of civilization, and the hopes of Christianity throughout the world. The American Tract Society, after an earnest inquiry, has decided not only on which side its duty lies, but the manner in which that duty is wisely to be performed. Let that action be denounced as it may—upon that action as upon the provisions against the slave-trade in the laws and constitution of the Union, we take our stand, and are not to be driven from our position by the cry of usurpation, whether from the disunionists of the South denouncing the Federal Constitution or the Executive Committee denouncing the principles and action of the Society.

I need hardly add, Sir, in conclusion, that in this letter, while replying freely to your argument, I have not intended to say anything inconsistent with the personal regard I entertain for you, a regard connected with pleasant memories of the past, and not less with my earnest hope that you may, on a more thorough review of the relation of the Tract Society to the great question of the age, see clearly your way to exert your large influence with the Managers of that body, to induce them fearlessly to utter its voice in behalf of right, justice, and humanity, regardless of the threats so flippantly uttered by the aiders of slavery and the slave-trade, and the abettors of treason and disunion.

I have the honor to be,

Sir, very respectfully,

Your friend and servant,

JOHN JAY.

Bedford, Westchester Co., N. Y.,

May 18, 1859.

THE WILBERFORCE CENTENARY.—Wednesday, August 24th, 1859, will be the ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF WILBERFORCE, the Parliamentary champion of Negro Emancipation in Great Britain.—His eminent services in the cause with which his name is forever identified would seem not only to justify but to demand an observance of the day on the part of those who are struggling to consummate the great work which he and his associates begun and carried forward with such remarkable success for so many years. Why not, for once, celebrate on that day the great event of West India Emancipation? We commend this suggestion to the earnest consideration of American Abolitionists, in the hope that, in some appropriate way, they will observe the Centenary of Wilberforce.—*A. S. Standard.*



## LETTERS FROM THE OLD WORLD.

NUMBER LXVI.

HUDDERSFIELD, (Eng.) May 16, 1859.

MY DEAR FRIEND:—Time has flown so rapidly, that I have some difficulty in realizing the fact that six weeks have passed away since our pleasant re-union with the French anti-slavery friends in the *Rue de la Chaussée d'Antin*.

Pastors Guillaume and Frederic Monod took the lead on this interesting occasion, and were well supported by the excellent Pastor Fisch, and the other ministers present. I could not, for one moment, have doubted the genuine character of the anti-slavery feeling there manifested, nor the sincerity with which promises were made to aid us in our efforts in behalf of the American bondman. Who, that listened to the spirit-stirring address of Frederic Monod—to his stern denunciations of American slavery—to his expressions of tender sympathy for the poor slave—to his solemn declaration that, *everywhere*, while traveling in the *Southern States*, he was *outspoken* on the slavery subject, and failed in his mission there, because he failed not to show "the people their transgression," nor to denounce their crying sin—who, I say, that listened to the burning eloquence of Mr. Monod on that occasion, could believe him a *recrunt* to the cause of anti-slavery? Nor I.

It was our privilege, while in Paris, to meet Mr. Monod several times, and to have a good deal of conversation with him on slavery, anti-slavery, the American Tract Society, and his "defence" thereof. The strictures on his defence first reached him while we were in Paris; he was feeling highly indignant at being (as he said in a note to me) "*uncarrantably misrepresented*," and could scarcely speak calmly on the subject. If Mr. Monod had resided a year in the United States, instead of taking a rapid tour of a few months, he would, without doubt, have arrived at a different conclusion, as to the *reasons* of the timid, cowardly (and as I think, *SINFUL*) policy of the American Tract Society in suppressing every word of anti-slavery truth, and have arraigned that policy, instead of saying a word in its defence. But, while I differ from him, in looking at the matter from his stand-point, I think he has been consistent. He is a leading member of the Paris Tract Society; he is, also, a zealous Protestant. Popery and its evils reign dominant on all sides in France; yet Mr. Monod has always objected strongly to any denunciations of Popery being introduced into the publications of the Paris Tract Society, at the same time that he has, at his own cost, written and published many tracts on the nature of Popery, its evils, and its sins, and sent them forth to do their work. So, he said, he would do, in the States, as regards anti-slavery tracts. He admitted, at the same time, that his view might be a mistaken one, and, doubtless, he had never dreamed of the mischievous use that could be made of his words, North and South, or that his attachment to the anti-slavery cause could be suspected for an instant from anything uttered by him. Perhaps our noble friend had failed to remember that Silence is a great sin of the American churches—of the American religious societies in general—of the Tract Society in particular. I wish, for my part, that this Society were scattered to the four winds of heaven—then one hindrance to the freedom of the poor slave would be out of the way; and no longer stand as a stumbling-block to any good, warm-hearted, earnest, hasty Christian man to fall over, nor for any infidel point to as one of the representatives of the Christian religion in the United States!

Our visit to was, throughout, one of much interest and pleasure; the kindness and

attention shown us by many agreeable friends there, will long be remembered; it was with regret that we bade adieu to them, and to their gay, bright, beautiful city, where we left the sun shining, and the trees, in the Champs Elyses and the Tuilleries Gardens, arraying themselves in their exquisitely-wrought mantles of fresh, spring green.

In fourteen hours and a half from the time of our quitting Paris, we were in London!—so much for the power of steam. Sunshine met us in Yorkshire; the leaden skies (so prevalent in our dear, little, foggy island) seemed to have vanished; for a few days, a canopy of blue over-spread Huddersfield, and we had summer weather. This, however, soon changed, and now, for many weeks, we have had the cold, cutting, easterly wind, the dire effects of which have been manifest in illnesses on all sides, proving the truth of the couplet, that,

"When the wind is in the East,  
'Tis neither good for man nor beast."

A fortnight since, we had the pleasure of meeting our Halifax anti-slavery friends at a tea-party in the Vestry of Zion Church. It is very gratifying to know the Society formed there in aid of the slave, little more than two years since, is now large and flourishing; the interest felt in the cause in Halifax is ever deepening and extending; but with such a vigilant, active and untiring Secretary as we are favored with there, who need be surprised by these cheering results? Our Halifax friends are in earnest, and decidedly lead the way in Yorkshire. The Huddersfield Anti-Slavery Society has suffered considerably from the illness and consequent withdrawal of its acting Secretary; and on account of illness and removal, in other quarters, we have had no meetings of late. This is to be regretted, for sure I am that the more frequently the committees meet, the greater the interest will become in the cause, and the more successful will the results be. "Time is short" with us all—we know not how short—and it behooves those of us that are actuated by Christian motives, to "work while we may," and see to it that "whatever our hand findeth to do, we do it with all our might," remembering that soon to each one of us will that night come "when no man can work."

One of the oldest and truest friends of the slave—a man whose sympathies were ever with the oppressed and the poor, whose ear was never deaf, whose hand was never closed against any tale of distress, and who daily and hourly carried out the Christian precept of doing unto others as he would they should do unto him—a man who was much honored and deeply loved by his friends, and thoroughly respected by his opponents, who labored unceasingly for the good of his fellow creatures the world over—this good, kind, uninterested, much valued Christian philanthropist has been suddenly summoned away from us to meet his reward. While sorrowing kindred and attached friends deeply mourn his loss, the melancholy tidings of his unexpected departure will fall like a mantle of sadness not only on the nation at large, but on people in far distant lands, who have learned to associate the name of JOSEPH STURGE with all that is "true" and "honest," "just" and "pure," "lovely" and of "good report."

23d May.

On reading the account of the funeral of our friend, Mr. Sturge, I was forcibly reminded of the passage of Scripture in the Acts, (viz:) "and devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him." The newspapers will have supplied you with all particulars given to the world of the closing moments of this excellent man. It has been, to me peculiarly interesting to learn (from one of his near relatives) that he had expressed a preference for a sudden termination. He "walked

with God," while on earth, and though "absent from the body,"

"Far from this world of toil and strife,  
He's present with the Lord;  
The labors of his mortal life  
End in a large reward."

May we strive to live the life of "the righteous," and so shall "our last end be like his."

The May number of your Monthly has reached us. I am both shocked and grieved to find that Dr. Cheever's lecture in Rochester was not better attended. Where were the church members? where the ministers? Where are the results of the "Revival," so far as Rochester is concerned? All "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal"—mere hollow mockery! One would have thought that every Christian man and woman would have rallied at once to the side of that noble and indomitable man of God—a man who has stood forth, a second Elijah, (opposed by the four hundred priests of Baal,) and dared to hurl the thunderbolts of God's Word against the crying sin of the land, slavery—a sin which the American church has striven to hide, as "Achan," of old, hid the "Babylonish garment," but which Dr. Cheever has dragged into the light of day, showing forth, by the beams of the sun of righteousness, all its native hideousness and deformity.—Alas! for poor Rochester! The absence of the ministers from that lecture of the noble and fearless Cheever shows that there is a grievous absence of sound practical Christianity among them. They are blind leaders of the blind, "paying tithe of mint, annis and cummin, and omitting the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith." Surely, without any breach of Christian charity, the whole denunciations of our Lord, contained in the 23d chapter of Matthew, may be consistently applied to the American church.

The "blessings of many ready to perish" are on Dr. Cheever, for the noble stand he is taking. He may be assured of the warm sympathy of Christian people on this side the Atlantic.—We are a practical people in dear, old England, and judge a good deal of "faith," by the works it brings forth.

The religious meetings held in London this month have passed off even more successfully than usual, I understand—notwithstanding that "wars," and "rumors of wars" are engrossing subjects of conversation at this time, and that the excitement attending a general election has scarcely subsided. Our journals give you full information of all political matters, and I prefer not to enlarge upon them in my scriptures, which are generally written hastily.

I hope to write again ere many weeks have passed away, and craving pardon for a somewhat rambling effusion, believe me to remain, now and always,

Your friend sincerely,

JULIA G. CROFTS.

AN ANTI-SLAVERY COLLEGE IN KENTUCKY.—A school has been established in Berea, Ky., under the patronage of the Ministers and Churches sustained by the American Missionary Association. It is decidedly and practically Anti-Slavery and anti-caste; and consequently, students are taken without respect to their color or race. It is the design of its friends to make it a permanent college; and, in a short time, the Rev. John G. Fee will make a visit North to secure funds in its behalf.

A paper published in Xenia, O., announces that Dr. J. S. Prescott, formerly of that place, is engaged in a movement to establish colonies of free colored persons in the counties of Dickinson, O'Brien, Osceola and Cherokee, in Iowa, and that meetings have been held in Washington, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other cities, to aid the enterprise. The Democratic organs in Dubuque have become bitterly wrathful, and often go into hysterics.



# SLANDER UPON DR. CHEEVER AND THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS.

[From the N. Y. Independent.]

The Church of the Puritans and their eminent pastor seem to be marked as victims of slander. Stories the most unfounded and incredible respecting the financial and moral condition of the church, and its relations to its pastor, are manufactured either by ignorance or by malice and sent abroad upon the wings of the wind. The latest canard of this sort, has reached us by way of London. In *The Anti-Slavery Advocate* (London) for May, 1859, we find a letter from Mr. F. W. Chesson, from which we make a few extracts.

'To the Editor of the Anti-Slavery Advocate :

'Dear Sir: I would beg the favor of a corner in *The Advocate*, to make your readers acquainted with an anti-slavery mission to this country, in which they cannot fail to take a lively interest. It is well known, at least to them, that Rev. Dr. Cheever of New York, by the noble stand which he has taken upon the slavery question, and especially by the apostolic fidelity with which he has waged war against slavery from his own pulpit, has provoked serious dissensions in his church. It may not be equally well known, that at one time these dissensions nearly ended in his own expulsion, that he now holds his office by a very precarious majority, and that nearly all the wealthy members of his congregation have withdrawn from his church their pecuniary support. The result is, that the income of the church from pews and other sources has greatly diminished, and that the majority, still a very narrow one, is compelled to assume a responsibility which they are ill able to bear, and which their co-religionists in New York and elsewhere manifest but little disposition to share with them. Under these circumstances, Dr. Cheever appeals to the "Christian churches of Great Britain and Ireland" for assistance. As he is himself unable to visit Great Britain to plead his own cause, Miss Johnstone, a member of his church, and a lady of earnest and indefatigable spirit, has come over to act in some measure as his representative. Her object is to obtain such assistance as will enable the Church of the Puritans to hold its ground, and to provide it with a fund that shall be secured in perpetuity to the church only on condition of its remaining faithful to its present principles. I confess that, with every disposition to hope for the best, I have some fear as to the result of an appeal to the British churches. The churches have of late manifested no interest in the anti-slavery cause. On the contrary, they have received with open arms men like Dr. Pomroy, whose whole influence is employed to support the pro-slavery religious institutions of America.'

Who Miss Johnstone may be, we have no means of knowing. When Phœbe was sent from Cenchrea to Rome, as a servant of the Church, Paul wrote to the brethren there a letter of commendation, exhorting them to receive her in the Lord, and to assist her in whatever business she had need of. It therefore accords with apostolic precedent, that a church should send a Christian woman as its messenger to other churches. But we cannot learn that the Church of the Puritans in this city has sent Miss Johnstone upon any errand to England; and we think the Leeds' Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society have done well in asking Miss Johnstone for 'detailed information respecting the circumstances in which Dr. Cheever's church is placed, and the precise disposition which is intended to be made of any funds that may be raised in its behalf.'

Whoever may be responsible for Miss Johnstone's mission, we regard these statements of Mr. Chesson as a public scandal, and a slander upon Dr. Cheever and his church.—We will not believe that either Dr. Cheever or his church have so far lost their self-respect as to make this humiliating appeal to England for assistance. It is a slander upon Dr. Cheever to say, that with all his genius, and eloquence, and fidelity, he is not able to sus-

tain himself in a church to which he has so ably ministered for ten years, but is obliged to send 'a lady of earnest and indefatigable spirit' over to England to act 'as his representative,' in begging money for his support! It is a slander upon a church, which in the short space of three months gave its pastor \$1,000 as a testimony to his fidelity, paid off an accidental debt of \$3,500, contributed \$3,000 to the Congregational Union, beside several hundreds of dollars to other objects of benevolence, to say that it is not able to sustain its own pastor, whose fidelity it has approved by most decisive votes and measures. The Church of the Puritans has never made any appeal to sister churches for financial aid; it has not asked its 'co-religionists' to share any of its responsibility; on the contrary, it has recently co-operated with the other Congregational churches of New York and Brooklyn in liberal subscriptions for the Welsh church in this city, and the Congregational church in Flushing. It is a shame that an 'earnest' woman should be proclaiming to the Christian public in England, that such a church is not able to 'hold its ground,' and needs a fund to help it support its minister!

If it were proposed that our demonstrative cousins upon the other side of the water should make a testimonial to Dr. Cheever personally, that were quite another matter.—Should he go to England for three months, he might receive as grand an ovation as did Mrs. Stowe. Such a tribute from England, spontaneous and honorable, would have its appropriate moral effect upon this country. But to employ 'an earnest and indefatigable' woman to beg in England a sustentation fund!—Dr. Cheever and his church know that this would be as ridiculous in the eyes of Americans as the other would be honorable.

It is amusing to notice poor Mr. Chesson's blunders in attempting to enlighten the English public as to the facts. He says:

'I am happy to state that, in the course of a few weeks, a statement of all the facts of the case will arrive from New York, and which, I have no doubt, your readers will be able to obtain in any number they may desire. In the meanwhile, such of our friends as may have access to recent files of *The New York Tribune*, *The Anti-Slavery Standard* or *The Liberator*, may obtain from the columns of those journals all the information they can possibly require. No advocate of a great cause could be sustained in a more worthy manner than Dr. Cheever has been by these influential organs of public opinion. Dr. Cheever has found his firmest friends and allies in the ranks of the American Anti-Slavery Society; and I may add, nothing could more conclusively justify the severe censures which this Society has passed on the conduct of the American churches in regard to the slavery question, than the heartless manner in which Dr. Cheever has been treated by the Bacons, the Thompsons, the Beechers, and other leading divines of his own denomination. The fact is, that the moment your opposition to slavery assumes a really practical form, the anti-slavery sympathies of these men vanish into the air. You may denounce slavery in the abstract as much as you please, but as soon as you make a direct attack upon pro-slavery bodies like the American Board, you are regarded as a disturber of the peace, a defiler of the ark, an enemy of the church.'

This is really amusing. The American Anti-Slavery Society occupied nearly the whole of its sessions in New York and Boston, in denouncing Dr. Cheever as wanting in consistency and courage, and fidelity to the cause of the slave. This was the staple of the speeches of Messrs. Garrison, Phillips, and Pillsbury, whose certificate *The London Anti-Slavery Advocate* declares to be indispensable to the good standing of any American in the anti-slavery cause. For weeks past *The Anti-Slavery Standard* and *The Liberator* have been filled with diatribes against Dr. Cheever, because he will hold fast his Christian integrity, and will not curse God and die.

We know what 'heartless treatment' Dr.

Cheever may have received from the Bacons, Thompsons, and Beechers. Dr. Bacon has had some friendly controversy with Dr. Cheever about public questions, in which the 'manner' of both was 'earnest and indefatigable' rather than 'heartless.' Dr. Thompson had the honor to assist at the very pleasant testimonial to Dr. Cheever, and they are and ever have been in the uninterrupted exchange of fraternal courtesies. Mr. Beecher recently invited Dr. Cheever to occupy his pulpit on the subject of slavery. Yet neither the Beechers nor the Thompsons have a vote in the American Board, while Dr. Cheever is in actual fellowship with it as a corporate member, and so a partaker in all its organic sins! It seems to us that there is need of some 'earnest and indefatigable' woman at home, to get at 'all the facts of the case.'

## KIDNAPPING IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

PHILADELPHIA, June 20, 1859.

A brief paragraph was published in your paper last week stating the fact that a gross outrage had been perpetrated in Cumberland County, in this State, by the abduction of a colored family therefrom into slavery. I am in correspondence with a highly respectable gentleman in the town of Carlisle, who has put me in possession of the particulars of the case, the chief of which I propose to give you, and they are as follows:

The family abducted consisted of a man named Butler, his wife and one child. They lived on the southern border of Cumberland County, near to a place known as Weakley's saw mill, which is within 12 or 15 miles of the Maryland line. They had come there from Adams County, and were highly esteemed by their neighbors—so says the *Carlisle American*—'for their industry, sobriety and general good behavior.'

This unoffending and meritorious family was on the night of the 10th inst., as appears from subsequent developments, stealthily seized and forcibly carried into Maryland as slaves. The next morning the family were missing, and the house was found empty. Articles of clothing were strewn around in confusion. The bread which had been put to rise for Saturday's baking stood on the hearth ready to be worked for the oven. The bed in which the little girl had been wont to sleep showed by its rumpled state that it had been robbed of its occupant. Outside, a carriage track was discovered, leading first to the house and thence to Paper Town, a village on the Baltimore Turnpike, where it was lost. The whole affair had been conducted with profound secrecy. Four or five white families live within a stone's throw of the house, but they heard nothing of the occurrence, and knew not what had transpired till the next morning. It was evident that the parties were well acquainted with the neighborhood, and well skilled in their business.

The people in the vicinity are much excited by the outrage, and the greatest indignation pervades the whole township. The leading men of the district, including such as the Peffers, Woods, Morrisons, Sterretts, &c., express themselves determined, at any cost, to bring the perpetrators to punishment. They have taken the matter vigorously in hand and already have arrested and lodged in two of the offenders; one proves to have been a resident of the neighborhood, the other in Littleton, Maryland. The latter was the chief actor in the nefarious business. His name is Myers. He admits that he tried off the negroes, and claims to have acted under legal authority. He came, he says, about two weeks since, with papers duly issued, authorizing him to arrest the parties in question. He called on the United States Commissioner, Thomas M. Biddle, who informed him that he had resigned his office. He then went back to Frederick—where he is reputed to own lives—and got authority by force, which he did. He professes to stand upon the law, and appears to have scruples as to



the character of the transaction. He doesn't hesitate to say that he follows the business of hunting up runaways, and expresses himself as confident that he will be released in a few days on bail. He is said to be an ill-conditioned fellow, with a hang-dog look that well befits his calling. He formerly had his abode in Adams County, but that he might be more convenient to his business, and more secure in its prosecution, he moved across the line.—His house is quite close to the boundary.

The manner in which this miscreant was caught is worth relating. When his connection with the abduction was ascertained, the services of Sheriff McCartney were put in requisition for his arrest; a more competent person could hardly have been found, for Mr. Cartney, from a long experience in the same line of business, was well up to the ways of border negro catchers. It is a comfort to think that the skill thus acquired is to be employed hereafter against rascals with whom he used to co-operate.

Myers, if taken on a Pennsylvania process, had to be caught this side of the Maryland line. Of this McCartney was well aware.—Myers's house is within thirty or forty yards of the boundary, close to the public road. A Justice of the Peace living in the neighborhood was persuaded by the Sheriff to co-operate in making the arrest. He sent word to Myers—McCartney lying in wait—that he wanted him to come over and witness an affidavit. The bait did not take; word was brought back that Myers was 'not well.'—Another expedient was adopted. McCartney crossed the line, unobserved, and took the stage which was coming to Pennsylvania, past Myers's house, which stands on the side of a hill. He enlisted the driver in his service, and gave him his cue. Handing him a large printed bill, headed 'Reward for Runaways,' he said: 'Put your horses briskly down the hill; pretend, until you get over the line, that you can't hold them; as you pass Myers's house, hold-up the handbills, and hallo, "Letter from the Sheriff," and seem as though you had more to say if your horses would only stop.'

The driver followed directions, and the ruse succeeded. Myers followed the stage to the place where it stopped across the line; McCartney, jumping from his seat inside, seized him, saying, 'You are my prisoner.' The prisoner made fight, grabbing for the Sheriff's neck. A scuffle ensued, in which the former was thrown upon his back, and with the aid of one of the passengers whose help was invoked, was handcuffed and made secure. He was brought to the county jail at Carlisle, in which he is now a prisoner. His intended victims are in the jail at Frederick. It is alleged by some that they are really slaves, and that 'Butler' is an assumed name. Their story is that he, Butler, was legally entitled to his freedom after serving two more years; that the daughter, who is now 13, was to be free at 28; and that his wife is a free woman.

The facts of the case have not yet been fully ascertained, but the men who have taken it in hand are determined, so far as it may be in their power, to see that full justice is done to all parties, innocent and guilty. Some of the Carlisle lawyers express the opinion that if these people should be proved to be slaves, as alleged, Myers will have been guilty of no legal offence; that it is the right of the slaveholder, under the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Prigg vs. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to seize his property wherever he may find it. This falls in with opinions expressed here, at the time of the decision in the Daniel Webster case, by some of the Vandyke partisans. It was proposed to re-arrest Daniel and carry him off summarily, under the Prigg decision. The Fugitive Slave law of 1850 these men said was cumulative, and did not set aside other methods authorized for the rendition of slaves. They did not try the expedient; but it is not improbable that their Southern brethren have been advised that there was no use of attempting to recover their runaways under the act of 1850, and that they had best fall back on the club law

laid down in the Supreme Court in the Prigg case, and successfully acted upon in several instances in this State.

Well are we satisfied that this should be the resort hereafter. It will hasten the final issue. If force is to be the word, the slaveholders will find that that is a game at which two can play. They had better remember the fate of Gorsuch. Besides, Pennsylvania has laws made and provided for the preservation of the peace and of the rights of her citizens in such cases, and it will not be easy for Frederick County Courts or other slaveholding tribunals to override these laws.—Grave questions of jurisdiction will be raised, by no means favorable to Slavery.

I propose, if there should be nobody else to do it better, to keep you informed of what may transpire in this case in the course of its progress.

K. M. J.

#### AN F. F. V. AND DAUGHTER.

[From the Meigs County (O.) Telegraph, May 9.]

On Tuesday last, our town was thrown into a most intense state of excitement by what was supposed to be a veritable "Fugitive Slave Case."

There has been a very pretty girl here attending school for two or three years past, to whom one of the F. F. V.'s stands in the double relation of *father* and *master*. As *master*, he sent her here to go to school, and as the acknowledged *father*, he has paid her boarding and tuition.

The girl is very much attached to her father, but from the fact that he is engaged in buying up slaves in Virginia, and shipping them South, she has had the good sense to refuse to return to that State for fear she might share the same fate. Last Winter a strong effort was made to induce her to return to Virginia, and large promises were made to her by her father, if she would do so; but she declined. As a last resort, her mother was sent over to persuade her to go, but she still refused. Her mother, on her return, was shipped South; the colored people, and others here, believing that it was the intention to ship both mother and daughter, if the girl could have been obtained.

On the day above mentioned, the father, in company with a very hard-looking customer, both well armed with revolvers, called to see the girl. She, having full confidence in her father, who had always acknowledged and treated her as his daughter, was not at all alarmed—in fact, it is said she had written to him to send, or come and bring her some money—but some of her friends, believing that the design was to kidnap her, raised such a cry of "murder," and other cries, that the town was instantly alarmed, and quite a crowd was soon congregated to ascertain the cause of the row. The Virginians solemnly protested their pacific intentions—the father protesting that he had come to visit the girl and pay her bills, without any intention of taking her away; that, in fact, he had emancipated her, and in proof of this, showed what purported to be a deed of emancipation, which he offered to give her. This instrument, however on examination, was found to be of no validity. This fact tended to increase the suspicion. All things, however, would have gone off smoothly but for the fury of one of the negroes, who had a private wrong of his own to revenge.

It seems that after the birth of the girl in question, her mother, with the consent of her master, married this excited individual, who by his efforts had bought and paid for his own body and soul, and had made a payment or two on his wife, whose freedom he had also purchased, and who was the mother of this girl before he purchased and married her.

Tawny as his skin is, he seems to have been somewhat outraged by the sale of his wife, after he had lived with her fourteen years, and had partly paid for her. He claimed that he had other grievances—that he had detected between his wife and the gentleman sundry peccadilloes, and that according to the law in the Sickles case, he had a right to kill the gentleman, and meant to do it instantaneously.

Hereupon the chivalry of Virginia found

safety in the house of a colored man, drawing the curtains of the windows to prevent being shot through them. Here were exhibited some of the tallest specimens of humble supplication ever poured fourth from the fear-shriven soul of mortal. Gods, men and negroes were implored to save him from the wrath of this furious "chattel."

At length, after the crowd had been excessively amused, and the Virginians scared, it was proposed that both parties ground their arms and come to a truce. Whereupon the Virginians surrendered their revolvers into the hands of Squire Lee, and the darkey his into the hands of Sheriff Smith, and the war ended.

The Virginians, pale and trembling, with the awful vision of the terrible darkey still haunting them, and accompanied by the "Squire," who was to escort them to "Old Virginia's shore," and there, in due form deliver up the revolvers, reached the ferry, where so terribly were they alarmed that they offered fifty dollars to the ferryman if he would land them "safely on the other side," before the darkey could get at them.

We are happy to say that the Virginia gentlemen has since sent to his daughter a *genuine* deed of manumission, and she is now free. She is almost pure white, intelligent and beautiful—such an article as would readily sell at from two to five thousand dollars in the South, according to the abundance or scarcity of that style of goods in the market. So that the gentleman has, according to the ethics of Slavery, sacrificed that amount of property.

HYANNIS BEDEVILED.—It is not often that we hear or read of a mean action on the part of Cape Cod people. Their humanity, especially, is proverbial. But the recent fugitive slave case at Hyannis develops a degree of meanness and baseness which we know cannot often be excelled. We could not much blame a master of a vessel for returning a runaway slave, or a runaway white man, if found in his vessel within the premises of the slave territory; but after the vessel had arrived in Massachusetts waters, and the slave had actually escaped in a boat, to voluntarily force him back, and not only that, but actually to pay a large sum to have him sent back into the hell of bondage from which he had escaped through so many privations—and then for another to engage, for a "value received," to freight back this flesh and blood—all this, we say, of Massachusetts men—and Cape Cod men too—is as disgraceful as it is rare; and the perpetrators should be made to feel how contemptible their conduct has rendered them to their kindred and neighbors. It is sad enough, and bad enough, to allow the slaveowner to catch his own "cattle," but when a Massachusetts freeman volunteers as a kidnapper and bloodhound, the act makes him an outlaw to all the best sentiments of decent society.—*Provincetown Banner*.

EX-COMMUNICATED.—Ezekiel T. Cox (the father of the Ohio representative commonly known as "Sunset Cox") has been for upwards of twenty years a member of good standing in what is called the Market Street Baptist Church of Zanesville, Ohio, and has resided upwards of forty years in and near that city. He has been United States Deputy Marshal for the Southern District of Ohio for the last year or two, and had charge of the fugitive, Charley Jackson, recently arrested by virtue of a warrant in his hands. In consequence of Mr. Cox's action in this matter, the above church resolved, among other things, that he "had participated in the fugitive slave case in a manner wholly unwarranted by the word of God, and by so doing had grieved his brethren in the church, and brought dishonor upon the cause of Christ and the church of which he is a member." All honor to the church who have so nobly vindicated their regard for the purity of Christianity, and may their faithfulness be abundantly rewarded.

At the late term of the Circuit Court of Lawrence county, Miss. Edward Langford was indicted for selling a hoop skirt to a negro without permission, and sentenced to pay a fine of \$100 and costs of suit.



## RECOLLECTIONS OF JOSEPH STURGE.

[The following tribute to the memory of an eminent British Reformer has been communicated to the *Evening Post* by his friend, Mr. Lewis Tappan of New York.]

In Remembrance of  
JOSEPH STURGE,  
Who died on  
THE 14TH OF 5TH MONTH, 1859.  
Aged 65 years.

Such is the inscription on a card just received from Birmingham, England. In the removal of this eminent philanthropist to a better world, his native land has been deprived of one of its best men, and it may be said, without exaggeration, that the world is a loser by this sad event. Though his affections were strongly centred in a happy home and congenial circle, yet they embraced the kingdom, and extended to all men. He might have said, Wherever there is human want to relieve, there is my country. Let us see.

Mr. Sturge was born of Quaker parents, at Elberton, near Bristol, August 2, 1793. His father was a farmer, and he was the sixth member of the family bearing in direct succession the name of Joseph Sturge, which he transmits to his only son, now twelve years of age. He first commenced business at Bewdley, on arriving at maturity, as a general dealer in grain, called, in England, corn-merchant, and afterwards, in 1822, settled at Birmingham. Here and at Gloucester, in partnership with his brother, under the firm of Joseph and Charles Sturge, he continued to carry on the business until his death. The firm was recognized as one of the principal corn-dealing houses in the world, their sales of foreign and domestic grain often amounting yearly to millions of dollars.

Though so largely engaged in business transactions, he devoted much of his time, and large portions of his wealth, to objects of private and general benevolence. He did this unostentatiously, but perseveringly, and his benevolent efforts took a wide range. His sympathies were especially with the poor, the enslaved, and all who needed a helper. He was distinguished by his great exertions against slavery, on behalf of peace, in opposition to the corn-laws, in the promotion of the principles of total abstinence, in the establishment of Reformatory Schools, and for an enlargement of the elective franchise.

His first appearance in public life was in the year 1833, from which time until the final abolition of slavery in the British dominions, he worked with Wilberforce, Clarkson, Brougham, Buxton and others, helping the cause with his pen, tongue and purse.

In 1834 he married Eliza, daughter of James Cropper, Esq., of Liverpool, and thus became related to the extensive family circle of which that eminent man was the centre, and whose motto was "to love every man and to fear no man." This marriage, however, was of short duration. His wife and only child being removed by death, he devoted himself with renewed zeal to the cause of suffering humanity, and thus found a solace for his grief in administering to the necessities and assuaging the sorrows of others. His sister Sophia, to whom he was warmly attached, and who possessed a kindred spirit, was the counsellor, colleague, and ever-ready helpmate of her brother in all his multifarious designs for doing good, until 1845, when she was removed by death. The *Birmingham Pilot* said of her: "Never, perhaps, were the active and passive virtues of the human character more harmoniously and beautifully blended than in this exalted woman."

Believing that the apprenticeship system was in fact a continuance of slavery, he made a journey to the West India Islands in 1837, at his own cost, at the head of a deputation, to examine the state of the negro population. A large amount of information was collected, which Mr. Sturge on his return to England laid before the parliamentary committee.—The substance of it was afterwards published in a volume entitled "The West Indies in

1837, by Joseph Sturge and Thomas Harvey." Mr. Sturge was mainly instrumental in procuring the act of Parliament by which slavery in every form was declared to be abolished in the British dominions.

On his way home from the West Indies he visited New York to form an acquaintance with the leading abolitionists of the United States, and to inquire into the state of American slavery.

The anti-Corn League in its early days was deeply indebted to Mr. Sturge, who was the intimate friend of the distinguished leader in that great enterprise, Mr. Richard Cobden.—Immediately on his return to England, at the request of the League, Mr. Sturge took up the extension of the suffrage, being the President of "The British Complete Suffrage Association," and the following year contested the borough of Nottingham. He failed in the election, but it was against powerful opposition and the lavish appliances of money and liquor, neither of which would Mr. Sturge permit to be used on his behalf. So consistent was he in practising his principles, that he would not go into the election until it had been first ascertained, by a show of hands, that he was the choice of a majority of the people, only a portion of whom were entitled to the suffrage. With him principle was everything. He would not sacrifice it for any personal consideration or political triumph. What a lesson to politicians! It was in consequence of this stubborn adherence to principle through his whole life that politicians and time-serving men stigmatised him as an impracticable.—They respected his undeviating integrity and exalted character, while they were vexed because he was so "inflexible." He never succeeds in his political efforts, said they, because he will not give way. The consequence was that the post of honor with Joseph Sturge was a private station.

In 1841 he again visited the United States. His object was expressed by him in the following words: "The objects which preferred the chief claim to my attention were the universal abolition of slavery and the promotion of permanent international peace." While here he traveled extensively, visited many friends of peace, temperance, and the anti-slavery cause; and he had interviews with influential men in public life. Before leaving the country he published an address "To the Friends of Immediate Emancipation in the United States." He said: "I am not one of those who despair of a healthful renovation of public sentiment which will purify the church as well as the state from this (slavery) abomination." He expressed a hope that a second World's Convention would be held in London; he reminded abolitionists that the fall of American slavery must be the death-blow to the horrid slave trade, to the foreign branch of which alone, he said, more than one thousand victims are daily sacrificed; and, in conclusion, expressed a hope that, if the forebodings of Jefferson—that he trembled for his country when he remembered that God was just—should be realized, each abolitionist might feel that no exertions on his part had been wanting to avert the Divine displeasure, and preserve the land from those calamities which, in all ages, have rebuked the crimes of nations.

The second general Anti-Slavery Convention held in London, June, 1843, and the Peace Convention that immediately followed, were largely indebted to Mr. Sturge for their incipency and prosperous proceedings and termination. During the sessions of these bodies, for two successive weeks, Mr. Sturge took a furnished house in London, and hospitably entertained, daily, large numbers of the members of the Convention, while in various other ways he generously contributed to the promotion of the great objects for which these assemblies of philanthropists from England, France, America, &c., had been held. More than any other man was he the life and soul of these gatherings, although at the time the financial concerns of his large business required his unremitting oversight and vigilance. The venerable Clarkson, being unable to at-

tend the Anti-Slavery Convention, on account of increasing infirmities incident to his advanced age, committed to the hands of Mr. Sturge his address to that body, by whom it was impressively read.

Until his removal by death, Mr. Sturge never swerved from his devotedness to the anti-slavery cause. He gloried, so far as a Christian may glory in any benevolent enterprise, in being an outspoken abolitionist, in the doctrine of immediateism, and he took peculiar pleasure in identifying himself, through evil and through good report, with ultra abolitionists, and with the colored man, bound and free. It was truly said of him by the missionary, William Knibb, "His name is engraven on almost every negro's heart." In a portrait of Mr. Sturge, taken in 1843 by an eminent artist, one hand rests upon the shoulder of a black child, while the other seems to be accompanying an appeal he is making, saying, on behalf of the slaves, of whom the child is a representative: "Am I not a man and a brother?"

In 1846, having buried his devoted sister, who had for so many years been at the head of his household, and his counsellor and coadjutor, he entered again into the marriage relation, with Hannah, daughter of Mr. Barnard Dickinson, of Coalbrooke Dale, who survives him, and by whom he leaves one son and four daughters.

When the Provisional Government was established in France, in 1848, says Mr. Cobden, he visited Paris as the guest of Arago, then Minister of the Colonies, and so forcibly did he plead the cause of the slaves, that the Minister successfully exerted his influence to obtain a decree putting an end to the system. The following year, says the *London Times*, when all Europe was convulsed with revolutions, he attended at Brussels the first of that remarkable series of Peace Congresses which continued to be held until 1852, and at all of which he was present, and had a principal share in the guidance of their proceedings.

During the war between Denmark and the Duchies, in 1848, he went first to the headquarters of the Schleswig-Holsteiners, and then to the capital of Denmark, to endeavor to persuade the belligerents to refer their dispute to arbitration.

The *Times*, after alluding to Mr. Sturge's visit to Paris, and his interviews with Lamartine and Arago on the subjects of peace and slavery, and success of that mission, says one of the best known incidents of his public life was his visit to the Emperor Nicholas of Russia, in 1854, when, in the depth of winter, he formed a deputation from the Society of Friends, composed of Robert Charleton, Henry Pease, M. P., and himself, to present an address of remonstrance against the war, solely on religious grounds. The deputation was courteously received; the Emperor made a verbal explanation of the cause of the war; he expressed his desire to avoid it; avowed his esteem for England and Queen Victoria; and afterwards transmitted to the Society of Friends a written reply to their address.

In 1856 he went to Paris as one of the deputation commissioned to present a memorial to the Emperor and the plenipotentiaries of the other foreign powers, in favor of inserting in the treaties of peace a clause binding the contracting parties to settle any future international dispute by arbitration. In the same year he undertook a journey to Finland, and laboriously investigated the miseries inflicted on the wretched inhabitants of the coast by the war which was then just brought to a close, while he administered with princely generosity to their necessities.

When the Water-Cure establishments had got into successful operation, Mr. Sturge felt a desire to impart the benefits of them to the poorer classes, and therefore fitted up one of them, committing it to the charge of a worthy physician and his assistants, so that persons in very moderate circumstances could avail themselves of the advantages of this system of cure at charges barely sufficient to defray the expenses. At another time, in conjunction with his brother Charles, he or-



ganized an establishment for the reformation of juvenile offenders, and, on being satisfied of their desire to conduct well, aided them in procuring employment. On many occasions has he helped poor youths and adults, in whose future good conduct he had confidence, to emigrate to this country, where they could commence anew, without suspicion or hindrance, confiding them to the oversight of some one who was fully and confidently apprised of their past career. Meritorious persons of various kinds, have experienced aid from Mr. Sturge in coming to this country with a view to better their condition; indeed his liberality, kindness and solicitude in these regards were extraordinary.

Within a few years Mr. Sturge, in company with another brother, purchased an estate in the British West Indies, island of Montserrat, "hoping to prove that sugar can be grown as cheap by free as by slave labor." He also aided in purchasing estates in Jamaica, to be re-sold, in small parcels, to the emancipated, so as to make them independent of exactions, and to qualify them to be electors.—Wherever there were lapses and a disposition to reform; wherever there was talent or moral worth crushed by the iron heel of tyranny; wherever there was enterprise struggling under a load of opposition or misfortune; wherever there was want that should be relieved, there was Joseph Sturge, with his sympathetic heart, ample purse and proffered aid. The rills of his benevolence were almost innumerable.

When Henry Vincent, the chartist, was imprisoned under a governmental prosecution, for giving too free utterance to his political opinions at mass meetings, he was bailed by Mr. Sturge, under whose patronage he renewed his labors with unfaltering courage, and was often on the same platform with distinguished members of Parliament, who were willing to be publicly associated with a reformer whose only crime was that he eloquently contended for the rights of the people. Mr. Sturge also befriended Arthur O'Neill, another public agitator, offering both him and Mr. Vincent his hospitality, his money and his open friendship. Both of these young men were persons of good character, good principles and extraordinary abilities.—Though frowned upon by the government and aristocracy, "the common people heard them gladly."

In politics Mr. Sturge was the friend and coadjutor of Cobden, Bright and their associates, whose general policy he approved though he did not servilely follow any leader. He went for universal suffrage, limiting it, however, as I believe, to those who could read and write, and opposing all property qualifications in electors. Though a loyal subject he was democratic in all his views, hating shams of every sort in politics or religion, and striving to rid his countrymen of all incubuses of church or state, of mammon or religion that weighed down any portion of the people, especially the deserving poor.

He carried his peace principles to the extent of believing in the inviolability of human life, and opposing the employment of all armed force. At a time when government was making strong efforts to enlist the young men of the country to supply the wasted ranks of the army in India, a recruiting officer was sent to Birmingham, who daily paraded the streets with his command and a band of music, while a show-bill was displayed on the walls of the town offering ten pounds sterling bounty, and good wages, to all able-bodied young men who were disposed to enter into her Majesty's service, &c. Soon after the walls were plentifully adorned with another show-bill of a similar size and type, to the following effect: "Wanted—5,000 able-bodied young men to enlist for India, to be shot at for sixpence a day!" The people stared, laughed and went on their way, while the lieutenant, with his men, returned to London without a single recruit. Joseph Sturge was much suspected of having something to do with this treasonable act.

His incessant labors and strong sympathies

evidently impaired his health. During the last years of his life he occasionally intimated his consciousness of this in his correspondence, while his letters evinced no abatement of interest in all affairs affecting the morals or happiness of his fellow-men. In a characteristic letter dated December 24, 1858, he said:

"A succession of engagements, including attending the funerals of departed friends, have prevented my acknowledging thy kind note before. I am obliged by thy reminiscences of our dear friend Judge Jay. Since I wrote thee last, death has been unusually busy amongst my friends and acquaintances, and I believe, with the exception of two or three, all my juniors. Among them a niece, the widow of my brother Henry, and the widow of a first cousin; and yet I fear I do not sufficiently realize how soon I must follow.—Thou wouldst perhaps see by the newspapers that John Bright was my guest while here, when he made his two famous speeches, one on parliamentary reform and the other on our foreign policy. He appears completely restored to health and vigor, and I trust God will spare him and guide him on the right hand and on the left, both spiritually and physically, and make him an agent of great usefulness in His hands. To show the position he now holds in this country, thou must know that there were about forty reporters each day taking down his speeches; two papers had the whole sent them by electric telegraph, and two others (one of them the *Times*) had a special train to London, and the next day the speech would be read by millions. I believe the moral effect was very powerful. So fickle is public opinion, for this man was burnt in effigy by the rabble during the Russian war, at Manchester, and afterwards rejected by a majority of the electors, while the week before last he was received in that city by one of the largest and most influential meetings ever assembled there, with almost unbounded applause. But I wish, with our friend John G. Whittier, that when alluding to the United States, he would 'speak out a little more decidedly against the dead fly in the ointment,' of your Republicanism—slavery. \* \* News has arrived from China that our people have succeeded in forcing the Chinese to admit opium at a duty! It would be difficult to conceive anything more diabolical than the doings of our late government, (and the present, I fear, will not keep clear of it,) in the whole of this business."

In a letter dated March 25th, 1859, he said:

"It seems long since I had the pleasure of hearing from thee, but I hope thou art in good health, though like me (who am much thy junior) thou probably feels the advance of age. I find a great difference both mentally and physically the last twelve months. I will thank thee to forward the enclosed to Richard Cobden. \* \* Thou wilt see by the *Anti Slavery Reporter* that we seem likely to have the slave trade and slavery continued under the name of coolie emigration and local apprenticeship acts. I feel glad to be excused by age from the political agitations which are going forward, but my friend, John Bright, does not go far enough for me; he should, I think, have demanded manhood suffrage.—Affectionately thy friend, JOSEPH STURGE."

In a letter from Mr. Edmund Sturge, the youngest brother, written three days after the death of Mr. Sturge, he says:

"For three or four months past my brother has exhibited the premonitory symptoms of heart-disease. These symptoms increased so much during the last few weeks as to prevent his taking walking exercise, and oblige him to ride for even short distances. He has lately been evidently exercising a daily preparation for the solemn change, and I deem it probable that his late correspondence with thyself may have indicated his expectation of a short continuance here. Still we fondly hoped, from the uncertain progress of such cases, his life might at least be spared to us a few years longer, little thinking, as was said of the prophet, 'Knowest thou not that the Lord will take thy master from thy head to-day,'

that his translation was so near.

"At ten o'clock, Friday evening, May 13, we were conversing with him at his house, when he appeared in better health than of late. At half-past six, next morning, I was summoned to see him, when the fatal paroxysm was strong upon him. He was then unable to speak, and in a few minutes it was over and the victory won. How can I describe the void that is left! We claim thy sympathy and prayers that we faint not under this affliction, nor fail to profit by it."

The *London Times*, speaking of the sudden and unexpected death of Mr. Sturge, states that "he had risen at his usual early hour, and his voice was heard cheerfully calling his children to join him in riding out before breakfast, in accordance with their ordinary practice in fine weather. On returning to his chamber he complained of sudden severe pain in the region of the heart, which lasted about twenty minutes, when it appeared to abate, but his strength was utterly prostrated, and at about a quarter past seven o'clock he breathed his last." The *Birmingham Journal* adds that his charity, the perfect simplicity of his character, his high honor, his sterling honesty in every relation of public and private life, and his tolerance of others opinions, were such that it would be difficult to say whether he was more respected by his opponents or his friends.

Mr. Sturge was a great man because he was a good man. He had rare personal advantages, and a happy combination of excellencies. Nature and grace had combined to give the world, in him, assurance of a man. In the language of the poet Whittier, with reference to him:

Unlearned, unknown to lettered fame,  
Yet on the lips of England's poor—  
And toiling millions, dwelt his name,  
With blessings evermore.  
Unknown to power or place, yet where  
The sun looks o'er the Carib sea,  
It blended with the freeman's prayer  
And song of jubilee.

Joseph Sturge was a man of a remarkably healthy appearance; about the middle height and stout. His temperament was cheerful; his countenance, especially his sweet smile, indicative of a heart full of benevolence; his sonorous voice and winning manners charmed all who approached him; he had constitutional diffidence mingled with self-respect; he had deference for good men, but was not in the least awed in the presence of the titled or powerful; he condescended to men of low estate, despised caste and all the aristocratic assumptions of men, never sinking his manhood before wealth or position, or arrogating to himself superiority before the lowly and despised; he had a strong sense of justice, integrity, honor; his reverence of the Supreme Being was profound; he respected manhood in all conditions of society; and to sum up all, he was, to use the language of the Apostle Paul, "A lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate."

A valued friend in Dublin, in alluding to his sudden and lamented death, says, "We cannot doubt but that his Lord found him waiting with his lamp trimmed and ready to follow Him, however sudden the call. The poor and the oppressed have lost in him one of the best friends our country was blessed with. We may trust that the Lord will raise up others to fill his place; but as yet we see them not." Whittier, in his tribute to Sophia Sturge, entitled "To My Friend on the Death of his Sister," uttered consolatory words that may with equal propriety be applied to the friends of her brother Joseph on the occasion of their great bereavement:

"Not upon thee or thine the solemn angel  
Hath evil wrought;  
[His] funeral anthem is a glad evangel—  
The good die not!  
God calls our loved ones home, but we lose not wholly  
What He hath given;  
They live on earth, in thought and deed, as truly  
As in His Heaven."

Mr. Sturge was too much of a Christian to be a sectarian, and too conscientious not to speak the truth fearlessly, even of his own



denomination. After returning from the United States he said publicly: "I feel bound to say, I returned with grief, under the conviction that the Society of Friends, in its corporate capacity, could not be considered as advocating total and immediate emancipation." How unlike the testimony an American would feel bound to bear towards the Quakers of England! Mr. Sturge associated freely with men of other denominations, and wherever he recognised a lover of freedom, peace, temperance or Christianity, he grasped his hand with the cordiality of a brother. He was popular with every denomination. As an evidence of it, he, at one time, was invited to preside over a convention of Baptists; and on another occasion, when he was about to address a multitude assembled at Liverpool to receive the temperance pledge from Father Mathew, was introduced by a Catholic priest. Wherever he arose to address a meeting he was rapturously cheered as a friend of the people and a champion of human rights. He was extensively known throughout the kingdom personally, or from the fame of his good deeds. And his reputation was not confined to his own country, for it extended to other countries. It had circumnavigated the globe.

His motto might have been: Be just and fear not. Of course he dared to be singular. His fearlessness brought upon him, as it ever does upon true reformers, the opposition of men, and even the displeasure of kindred and friends. "There," once said he to the writer in Birmingham, "there goes a member of our society; he is going to the same meeting with us; he is a good man, but he is so opposed to my political sentiments and course that he avoids me, and manifests his dislike." At another time he mentioned the case of a distinguished woman, who had regarded him with much affection, and who had annually visited his family, but who had intimated to him that she could not consistently continue her visits, owing to the stand he had taken before the public. Mr. Sturge's gentle nature and acute sense of wrong made him feel such conduct very keenly; but he forgave the misguided persons, and did not swerve a hair's breadth from the line of duty; for, as he once said: "If we are right in principle, we should leave the consequences to God."

As a manager of public meetings, and as a presiding officer, Mr. Sturge had a happy talent. Though naturally averse to public speaking, and diffident of his ability to entertain or instruct an audience, he acquired an easy and impressive mode of speech, which, with his tact in adapting his thoughts to the occasion, made him a popular and interesting speaker. Thus, his love to a good cause, and his disinterestedness, overcame his timidity and inspired him with self-control, and gave him readiness of utterance. He was in this matter, as in all others, contented with his natural endowments and acquisitions, while he was continually aspiring after higher attainments.

Mr. Sturge was a true Christian, albeit such men as he were prohibited uniting with the Evangelical Alliance. He believed in the Divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures. He made the Redeemer his model. He relied on the mercy of God and the atoning sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, and not on any worthiness of his own for forgiveness and acceptance at the bar of God. He had consecrated his life, his possessions, his influence, his all to God and humanity; what had he then to fear? In concluding this sketch of a beloved friend, a genuine philanthropist, an unpretending yet consistent Christian, who is not struck with the appropriateness of the application to him of the following description of the man of Uz?—

When the ear heard me, then it blessed me;  
And when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me:  
Because I delivered the poor that cried,  
And the fatherless, and him that had none to help him.

The blessing of him that was ready to perish  
came upon me,  
And I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy.  
I put on righteousness, and it clothed me;  
My judgment was as a sabre and a diadem.  
I was eyes to the blind,  
And feet to the lame;

I was a father to the poor:  
And the cause which I knew not I searched out.  
L. T.

#### MISCELLANEOUS NEWS ITEMS.

The Personal Liberty Bill which had been introduced into the New Hampshire House of Representatives has been indefinitely postponed. The bill provided that any person who shall aid or abet in the rendition of a person claimed as a slave, shall be punished for the first offence by five years imprisonment, and for the second offence by imprisonment for life.

The Senate of Connecticut has voted down the proposition to amend the Constitution of the State. The one to extend the right of suffrage to colored men, and requiring all new voters to read the English language, had five votes in its favor to sixteen against. The second, requiring citizens hereafter naturalized to wait one year before they could exercise the elector's privilege, received seven votes in its favor to fourteen against.

Francis Mitchell, a porter on board of the steamship Marion, has been committed to jail in Charleston for secreting a slave on board of that steamer, preparatory to an escape to New York.

Before its adjournment, the New Hampshire House of Representatives adopted a series of strong anti-slavery resolutions, in which they take occasion to denounce the present National Administration as corrupt and extravagant.

The Yazoo (Miss.) Democrat, an Administration organ, says:—The only practical means of perpetuating our present system of labor, is by importing Africans; and adds, 'If the South believes that her necessities demand more labor, and she has not the courage to procure that labor at any hazard, then let her perish as ignominiously as her cowardice deserves.'

A colored woman, named Flora Hawkins, died in the African Church at Cincinnati last Sunday. She became exceedingly happy during the service, and, while in the act of shouting, fell dead in her seat. A sudden hemorrhage of the lungs produced instant strangulation.

The Tampa (Fla.) Peninsula of May 21 says:—"Madame Rumor tells us strange stories about a cargo of slaves landed somewhere on the Florida coast. We don't vouch for the truth of this report, but would not be surprised to have it confirmed in a few days."

Apropos of Douglas having spoken in his Illinois speech of "niggers," Senator Seward is reported to have said that "no man can be elected President of the United States who spells negro with two g's." Wendell Phillips says that it is the wittiest thing Senator Seward ever got off.

Hon. R. C. Winthrop declines to be a candidate for re-election to the Vice-Presidency of the Boston Tract Society, for the reason that it favors the publication of anti-slavery tracts—a thing with which it rightfully should have nothing to do!

A dispatch to the Secretary of the Navy states that slavers bound to several Southern States are now on the coast of Africa. They are expected here this fall, with slaves for the Mississippi markets.

A petition is in circulation in New Hampshire praying the Legislature of that State to pass a law forbidding the delivery of any fugitive slave to persons claiming him under the laws of a slave State. The petition is receiving numerous signatures.

The African Methodist Episcopal Church has several Annual Conferences, about 300 traveling preachers, and 20,000 members in the U. S. and Canada.

Mr. Molineaux, an intelligent colored man, for the few past years proprietor of a gymnasium in Worcester, has been selected as instructor in the gymnasium now erecting at Cambridge for the use of the students.

The Crocket (Texas) Telegraph is informed that more than two thousand negroes have been brought to and settled in the region of country within eight miles of Hempstead, during the winter.

The Supreme Court of California, in a case between a citizen of that State and a Chinese Benevolent Company, has decided that idol worship is not forbidden by the Constitution.

Edward B. Bacon, master of the schooner Elizabeth of Hyannis, was arrested at Gloucester, Mass., last Friday, on the charge of returning to Norfolk the fugitive slave, Columbus Jones, who was brought into Hyannis in the brig Paterson. Bacon waived an examination, and gave bail in \$2,500 to appear before the Superior Court at Barnstable.

The actual number of students now in attendance at Oberlin College is 860, of whom 527 were males and 333 females. Of these 225 were new students.

The Western Christian Advocate says that all the preachers of the Episcopal Church, North, except two, have been driven out of Texas by the slaveholders.

It is stated that there are a few slaves still held in New Jersey. The Monmouth Herald says there are three slaves now in Freehold, and quite a number can be found in other parts of the county. A negro slave died in Alexandria, Hunterdon county, a week or two since, at an advanced age. There are two slaves now living in Madison, Morris county.

The coast survey steamer Walker reports that the bark J. W. Cobb had towed into Havana a New York schooner, which she picked up, scuttled and abandoned, off Mantanzas—She had previously landed a cargo of negroes.

One of the Boston Knight Templars who went to Virginia, bought a negro man for \$600 for a free colored woman in Boston, who furnished the money, and is to marry him.

A slave, one hundred and twelve years of age, died at Hogansville, Ga., on the 20th ult. He retained his eyesight up to the day of his death.

Thirty-three stars must be on the National Flag from and after the 4th of July next. This is in compliance with the act of Congress passed April, 1848, which declares that, on the admission of every new State, one star shall be added, and that each addition shall take place on the 4th of July next succeeding such admission.

The Washington correspondent of the Eve. Post says it is understood there that the National Convention of Republicans to nominate a Presidential candidate for 1860 will be held in Wheeling next June, after the Charleston Convention shall have nominated its ticket.

The people of the southern part of Nebraska are agitating the annexation of that part of their territory to Kansas.

The Apalachicola Advertiser of June 15th states that Norton, chief mate of the slaver 'E. A. Rawlins,' has been acquitted. Henry Sloan of the same party has been sentenced to three years imprisonment, and \$1,000 fine for manslaughter on the high seas. The captain and third mate will be tried at Pensacola this week.

Kossuth publishes a card to his countrymen in America, assuring them that the time has not yet come for them to leave their homes here to take part in the struggle for the redemption of their native land. He invites them to wait patiently but confidently.

The Secretary of the Treasury has addressed a letter to a gentleman in Athens, Ga., defending the President's course in relation to the returned Africans of the slaver Echo, and denying that the Colonization Society was instrumental in ameliorating the condition of the captives.

THE SLAVE TRADE.—The proposition to re-open the African slave trade is daily growing in popularity in the South. Public meetings are held, and resolutions adopted, denouncing the laws which forbid the traffic, in unmeasured terms. W. L. Yancey, of Alabama, a bold and able man, who was some years in Congress, is out for it. Senator Brown, of Mississippi, apologizes for it; and although professing to oppose it, he adroitly, like Gov. Wise, satisfies those who favor it by declaring in favor of repealing the laws which prohibit it.

Amid this general defection, it is highly honorable to the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Thompson, a Mississippian, that during his recent visit to North Carolina, he denounced the proposition in round terms, on moral as well as political grounds.—*National Era*.